The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogennetos

Author(s): J. B. Bury

Source: *The English Historical Review*, Apr., 1907, Vol. 22, No. 86 (Apr., 1907), pp. 209-227

Published by: Oxford University Press

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/550563

The English Historical Review

NO. LXXXVI.—APRIL 1907 *

The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogennetos

THE treatise on the ceremonies of the Byzantine court, commonly known by the title *De Cerimoniis*, is ascribed to Constantine VII in the unique manuscript in which it is preserved.[1] It is clear that, if this attribution is true, it is not completely true of the text which has come down to us, since this text contains some passages relating to events subsequent to Constantine's death. These passages, which will be noticed below, led Reiske to throw out the conjecture that the original compiler was not Constantine VII, but his grandson, Constantine VIII.[2] As there is no evidence whatever to connect Constantine VIII with the work this suggestion, which Reiske only put forward tentatively, has met with no favour; and it is now generally admitted that the original compilation belongs to the reign of Constantine VII.[3] A careful examination of the treatise leaves no room for doubt that this is the case; but there is considerable uncertainty as to the limits of the work in its first shape and the extent of the later additions. Thus Rambaud concluded that the greater part of book ii. dates from the end of the tenth century.[4]

Besides the problem of determining how the work came to

[1] In the University Library at Leipzig: a handsome parchment, saec. xi/xii. First edited by Leich and Reiske, 1751–4; reprinted in Bonn *Corpus*, 1829-30.

[2] Reiske's *Praefatio*, ed. Bonn, p. xxiii.

[3] So Rambaud, Krumbacher, Bieliaev.

[4] *L'Empire grec au dixième Siècle*, p. 136; but he also contemplates the reigns of Constantine VIII and Romanus III (p. 134).

assume its present form, the character of the original compilation, which consists largely of transcripts of older documents, presents a second problem to the critic. It is important to distinguish the compiler's work from his material, and to discover the periods to which the various incorporated documents belong. In his book dealing with the ceremonies described in book i. cc. 1–37, Bieliaev has made several useful observations bearing on this question, and Diehl has recently made a valuable contribution.[5]

I. General Analysis of the Treatise.

§ 1. A comparison of the preface to book ii. with the preface to book i. shows that book ii. was part of the design of the original author. The preface to book i. announces as the subject *ἡ τῆς βασιλείου τάξεως ἔκθεσίς τε καὶ ὑποτύπωσις*, and promises to describe *ὅσα παρὰ τῶν παλαιοτέρων ἐφευρέθη καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἑωρακότων διηγγέλθη καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἐθεάθη καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνηργήθη* (p. 4). The preface to book ii. (p. 516) draws a distinction between two kinds of material—(1) written records, *ὅσα συγγραφῆς παρά τισιν ἔτυχεν*; and (2) what has been handed down orally, *ταῖς μνήμαις διασωζόμενα καὶ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀκολούθως τοῖς νεωτέροις παραπεμπόμενα*. It is stated that the former, hitherto scattered and disconnected, have been arranged, 'by our care,' in logical order and included in book i. (*ἐν τῇ πρὸ τῆσδε βίβλου*); the latter are to form the content of book ii. (*ὅσα ἡ παροῦσα βίβλος ἐμπεριέχει*). There can be no doubt that the two prefaces are from the same pen, as they profess to be; the style and tone are exactly the same. But the first preface does not announce, or seem to contemplate, a division of the work into two books, nor does it discriminate the two classes of material which determine that division. Hence we can conclude that the preface to book i. is a preface to the work as a whole, written before book i. was completed or perhaps begun, and that the second book was an afterthought.[6]

It is to be observed that, although in these prefaces the writer

[5] The chief literature on the *De Cerimoniis* is as follows: the Prefaces of Leich and Reiske (in vol. i., ed. Bonn), and the Commentary of Reiske (in vol. ii., ed. Bonn); Rambaud, *op. cit.* (1870), pp. 128–36; H. Wäschke, *Studien zu den Ceremonien des K. Porphyr.* (1884); Krumbacher, *Gesch. der byz. Litt.*[2] pp. 254–7 (where references to works on special points will be found); D. Th. Bieliaev, 'Ezhednevnye i voskresnye priemy vizantiiskikh tsarei i prazdnichnye vykhody ikh v khram sv. Sophii,' v ix–x v. 1893 (being the 2nd book of his *Byzantina*); Bieliaev's preface deals with the origin and composition of the work, and is the fullest study of the question that has hitherto appeared. The first book of his *Byzantina* ('Obzor glavnykh chastei bolshago dvortsa,' 1891) is also indispensable. For the works of Markovich and Kanevski it is enough to refer to Bieliaev's preface, p. xvi *sqq.* I cite his two volumes as *Obzor* and *Priemy*. Diehl, *Etudes byzantines* (1905), p. 293 *sqq.*

[6] This conclusion is supported by the fact that while in the MS. book ii. is headed *τὸ δεύτερον βιβλίον* (p. 509) book i. is not headed *τὸ πρῶτον βιβλ'ον*.

does not give any express indication of his identity, there is not only nothing to contradict, or cast suspicion on, the authorship of Constantine, but the general tone and some particular phrases seem to bear out its imperial origin. For instance, p. 3: *ἡμῖν δὲ καὶ λίαν φίλον καὶ περισπούδαστον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων οἰκειότερον, ἅτε διὰ τῆς ἐπαινετῆς τάξεως τῆς βασιλείου ἀρχῆς δεικνυμένης κοσμιωτέρας κ.τ.λ.* And the distinction between *παρ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἐθεάθη* and *ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνηργήθη* (p. 4, l. 15) seems a pretty clear discrimination of the reign of Romanus I, when Constantine was a subordinate *basileus*, from his own reign as *basileus autokrator*.

§ 2. Book i. cc. 1–83 displays the orderly arrangement which is claimed for it in the preface to book ii. The ceremonies follow each other *εἱρμῷ τινι καὶ τάξει λελογισμένῃ*, and there is nothing in these eighty-three chapters which points to a date subsequent to Constantine VII. It is to be noted that there is a considerable lacuna; a portion of the manuscript has been lost; and the chapters, which now number eighty-three, were originally ninety-two. This lacuna will claim our attention subsequently; for the present we may represent the arrangement of book i. as follows:—

Book I. cc. 1–83=1–92 *.

cc. 1–37 (=46 *): processions and ceremonies on religious festivals.
cc. 38–83 (=92 *): secular ceremonies.

The rest of book i. cc. 84–97 (or properly 93*–106*) consists of material different in character:

cc. 84, 85: ceremonies at the appointment of certain functionaries.
c. 86: investitures of certain officers.
cc. 87, 88: reception of ambassadors announcing proclamation of western emperor.
cc. 89, 90: reception of Persian ambassadors.
cc. 91–5: ἀναγορεύσεις of Leo I, Anastasius I, Justin I, Leo II, Justinian I.
c. 96: ἀναγόρευσις of Nicephorus II.
c. 97: ceremony of appointing proedros of senate.

The two last chapters proclaim themselves as subsequent to the reign of Constantine. The office of *proedros* was first instituted by Nicephorus Phocas, and first filled by Basil the *parakoimomenos*.[7] Hence c. 97 cannot be prior to the reign of Nicephorus Phocas. C. 96 was written during his reign, for the writer refers to him as *ὁ εὐσεβὴς καὶ φιλόχριστος βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν Νικηφόρος*

[7] Cedrenus, ii. 379, *μήπω πρότερον ὄντος τοῦ ἀξιώματος* (cp. Leo Diaconus, p. 49). Reiske has drawn illegitimate conclusions (Comm. p. 465), and he is followed by Rambaud (*op. cit.* p. 132). They both mistranslate the passage of Cedrenus. Cp. Bieliaev, *Priemy*, pp. 28–9 note.

(p. 434); and one might expect to find that c. 97 also was an addition of the same period. Internal evidence confirms this explanation. We find prominence given to the Caesar (*τοῦ εὐτυχεστάτου Καίσαρος*) along with the *βασιλεὺς αὐτοκράτωρ* (p. 443, 7, 10, 13). This proves that there was a Caesar when the ceremony was held from which this description is generalised. Nicephorus Phocas, on his accession, created his father, Bardas, Caesar.[8] After this reign there was no Caesar at Constantinople until the end of the reign of Michael IV, when his nephew, Michael Kalaphates, was adopted by Zoe and raised to the rank of Caesar. We are justified in concluding that c. 97 was based on the ceremony which promoted Basil to the office of *proedros* at the beginning of the reign of Nicephorus; and we note as significant that no account is taken of the *μικροὶ βασιλεῖς* (Basil II and Constantine VIII). They are equally ignored in the acclamations of c. 96. The addition, then, of these two chapters points to a redaction of book i. in the reign of Nicephorus.[9]

§ 3. Cc. 84-95 are documents dating unquestionably from the sixth century. This is abundantly evident from both style and contents. In particular c. 86 can be dated between A.D. 548 and 565,[10] c. 87 (with 88) in the reign of Justinian. The series of *ἀναγορεύσεις* was also compiled in Justinian's reign and formed one whole, as is shown by the fact that all the emperors are referred to as deceased, except Justinian (*τὸν εὐσεβέστατον ἡμῶν Ἰουστινιανόν*).[11] That the series is taken from the work of one writer, who looked back on the coronation of Leo I as ancient history, is proved by the last sentences of c. 91.

As the evident origin of all these chapters in the sixth century is generally admitted it is unnecessary to enumerate the marks (offices, institutions, technical nomenclature) which differentiate them from the rest of book i. The only question which admits of dispute is their authorship. The lemmata in the manuscript state that cc. 84, 85 are taken *ἐκ τῶν τοῦ μαγίστρου Πέτρου*. Hence we are

[8] Leo Diaconus, p. 49. It is hardly necessary to observe that the passage in the preface to Nicephorus Phocas, *De velitatione bellica*, p. 185 (ed. Bonn), refers to this Bardas Caesar (Βάρδας ὁ μακαρίτης Καῖσαρ), and not, as I have somewhere seen it explained, to the uncle of Michael III.

[9] Rambaud (with Reiske) contemplates the possibility of c. 97 dating from the sixth century, the πρόεδρος being the old *princeps senatus*. But, apart from other objections, such a date is peremptorily excluded by the style (which is homogeneous with that of the ninth and tenth century ceremonies, in marked contrast with that of the sixth-century documents, cc. 84-95) and by later institutions which are implied.

[10] Theodora dead, 390, 9; Justinian still alive, 391, 17.

[11] P. 433, 1. I may observe that in this chapter, 433, 5, κομέντον should be corrected to κοβέντον (*conventum*). The mistake was due to the easy confusion of μ and β in tenth and eleventh century MSS. So in *De Adm. Imp.* 74, 20, Νεμογάρδας should be corrected to Νεβογάρδας (Novgorod).

justified in assigning them to the περὶ πολιτικῆς καταστάσεως[12] of Peter the Patrician, whose position as *magister officiorum* explains his special interest in these ceremonies. It was a natural conjecture of Reiske that not only cc. 84 and 85 but the following ten chapters also belong to Peter. This view was rejected by Wäschke,[13] but probability, as Patzig has shown, is entirely in its favour.[14] Otherwise we have to believe that these chapters, here juxtaposed, have been taken from two (or more) different works, dating from the reign of Justinian, similar in subject and uniform in style.

The authorship, however, is unimportant for the present purpose. For that purpose, and in relation to Constantine's work, all these chapters form a single group which stands apart from cc. 1–83. (1) Whereas 1–83 are a guide to the actual court ceremonial of the tenth century, 84–95 are of purely antiquarian interest. They not only describe ceremonies which had been changed in character, but concern obsolete institutions (e.g. the Augustalis of Egypt, the κόμης σχολῆς), and apply to circumstances which no longer existed (the Persian kingdom; the Ostrogothic kingdom, or western emperors, in Italy). (2) 91–5 describe ceremonies as performed on particular historical occasions. In 1–83 the descriptions are always generalised. (3) This group stands quite outside the arrangement of 1–83. If 84, 85 had been part of the design of book i. they should, in accordance with the principle of its arrangement, have followed 43–59. These considerations establish that 84–95 are an accretion, lying outside the homogeneous unity of the book. It does not follow, however, that they may not have been added by the author himself, just as in a similar case a modern writer might furnish in an appendix extracts of antiquarian interest.

§ 4. Book ii., in contrast to book i., is a miscellany showing little attempt at arrangement. We learn from its preface (as we have seen) that it was taken in hand after the completion of book i., and that its aim was to describe ceremonies (τάξεις) which had not been already committed to writing. Cc. 1–25 conform to this scheme, and are homogeneous with book i. 1–83, with the exception of c. 17. They all describe ὅσα δεῖ παραφυλάττειν on certain occasions, and so continue and supplement the ceremonial of book i. Fol. 203 of the manuscript is missing; it contained the end of c. 16, c. 17, and the beginning of c. 18. According to the index (p. 511) c. 17 described the ἀναγόρευσις of Romanus II. We find

[12] See Suidas *sub* Πέτρος ὁ ῥήτωρ.

[13] *Ueber das von Reiske vermutete Fragment der Exzerpte Konstantins* Περὶ ἀναγορεύσεως. Dessau, 1878.

[14] Patzig, *Byz. Zeitschr.* ii. 436–7. On Peter's use of colloquial Greek in a relation of his embassy to Persia see Menander, fr. 12, *F. H. G.* iv. 217. Cf. Krumbacher, *Gesch. der byz. Litt.* p. 339. Bieliaev also accepts Reiske's view as probable (*Priemy*, p. xxxiii, note).

also, appended to c. 15, descriptions of the particular proceedings on the occasions of the receptions of Saracen ambassadors and of a Russian princess in the reign of Constantine. Although such accounts, relating to specific occasions, are not found in book i., 1–83, they can hardly be said, for this formal reason, to be interlopers or to imperil the unity of the group cc. 1–25. But it is only these first twenty-five chapters that can be said either to conform to the programme of the preface or to continue the subject of book i.

Cc. 26–39 are antiquarian and historical, and must have been, for the most part, transcribed from written records. C. 26 relates to Theodosius I (with reference to a life of St. Ambrose). Cc. 27–30 describe ceremonies in the reign of Heraclius, cc. 31–7 acts in the reign of Michael III; c. 38 recounts the enthronisation of Theophylactus as patriarch in A.D. 933; c. 39, on the obsolete office of the praepositus of the patriarch, refers to an ἀσφάλεια of Heraclius.

§ 5. Thus ii. 26–39 bear a relation to ii. 1–25 similar to the relation which i. 84–95 bear to i. 1–83. The rest of book ii. is of a more miscellaneous character. C. 40 contains an antiquarian explanation of the origin of the twelve λῶροι worn on Easter Sunday by the emperor, *magistri*, &c., and an enumeration of treasures preserved in certain chapels; and c. 41, which seems closely connected, an enumeration of ἀλλάξιμα. C. 42 describes the imperial tombs in the church of the Holy Apostles. C. 43 gives the acclamations of the army on the occasion of triumphs. Cc. 44, 45 are copies from official schedules of military armaments in the reigns of Leo VI (A.D. 902), Romanus I (A.D. 935), and Constantine VII (A.D. 949), and are quite alien to the subject of the work. Cc. 46–8 form a group concerning the official style of address to be observed in relations with foreign and client princes. Cc. 49 and 50 contain respectively tables of the taxes paid by officials on their appointment and of the stipends of strategoi and kleisurarchai, in the reign of Leo VI. In c. 51 we have the description of a ceremony. Cc. 52, 53 consist of the *Kletorologion* of Philotheos, composed in A.D. 900; and c. 54 is a *notitia episcopatuum* by Epiphanius of Cyprus, which Philotheos added as an appendix to his work. C. 55 defines the distribution of the fees paid by patricians on their elevation to that rank. The manuscript breaks off in this chapter, but the index shows that the book contained two more chapters, 56 being a life of Alexander of Macedon and 57 containing τοῦ φυσιολόγου ἡ τῶν ἑκάστου θηρίου θαυμαστικὴ ἕξις, πρός τε θεὸν ἀναγωγὴ καὶ τῶν ἐν βίῳ εὐαρεστούντων λόγοι ν'.

The titles of these two lost 'chapters' prove that book ii. of our manuscript includes matter which cannot have formed part of book ii. of the treatise on ceremonies designed by Constantine VII,

or of any ceremonial book. The other chapters which have been enumerated fail to conform to the programme announced in the preface, but these two have not even the remotest connexion with the subject of the work. Hence we can conclude with certainty that book ii. assumed its present form and compass by a purely mechanical process of stringing together and numbering as chapters *documents which happened to be physically associated with the original book ii. of Constantine.*

§ 6. Setting aside 56 and 57, most of the other chapters of book ii. might be alleged to have some bearing, near or remote, on the theme of the book. The relevance of cc. 43 and 51 is obvious. Cc. 40, 41 might be considered as notes on certain costumes and churches mentioned in various ceremonies, while cc. 49, 50, and 55 may be regarded as excursus to the ceremonies which pertain to the appointment of officials. Cc. 46–8 are also distinctly appropriate as an appendix. The enumeration of the tombs in the church of the Apostles, c. 42, might be *à propos* of the reference to certain tombs in that church in c. 6 (p. 533). It is to be observed that between cc. 41 and 42 there was once another document, described in the index (p. 513) as a brief list of the emperors who reigned at Constantinople, beginning with Constantine the Great. A leaf seems to have been lost between ff. 216 and 217 of the manuscript (cp. Reiske, p. 754). The index numbers this list c. 42, and throws together as c. 43 the two chapters which are numbered c. 42 and c. 43 in the text. There was evidently a confusion in the capitular arrangement here; and when we note that the paragraph which appears as c. 41 really belongs to the latter part of c. 40 we may conclude that the division ought to have been: 41, list of emperors; 42, imperial tombs; 43, *εὐφημία ὑπὸ τῶν στρατοπέδων*. A list of emperors is an irrelevancy; its occurrence in this place may possibly have been determined by the adjacent list of the imperial tombs, to which it might have been intended to serve as a chronological guide.

It is difficult to see how the descriptions of the armaments sent on various occasions to Crete and Italy in cc. 44, 45 have any relation to the subject of the book, or how a writer treating of court ceremonies could have thought of introducing them in any shape into his work. The fact that they contain some information about some military officials and their bureaux is obviously no justification. They must be placed in the category of irrelevant matter.

On the other hand cc. 52, 53 are a document which is strictly pertinent and cognate, the *Kletorologion* of Philotheos. But can we suppose that the writer of the original book ii. intended to include in is work a complete treatise by an earlier writer? Such a supposition would be in manifest contradiction to his

intention as declared in the preface, and seems in itself unlikely. It is not even as if this treatise of Philotheos had not been independently published. Written as a practical manual in A.D. 900, we should *a priori* expect it to have been disseminated, and this expectation seems to be confirmed by the discovery of a part of the treatise in a miscellaneous manuscript in the Patriarchal Library of Jerusalem.[15] The document was identified, and the variants published, by Uspenski.[16] Though it is not possible to demonstrate that this copy was not transcribed from a copy of the *De Cerimoniis*, book ii., there is nothing to suggest that this was the case; and the fact that the same manuscript contains another document dealing with the ranks and dignities of the Byzantine court, which is not included in the *De Cerimoniis*, may be urged as a positive indication that the book of Philotheos came to the scribe of the Jerusalem codex in another form.

§ 7. The result of our analysis is that in the collection which the manuscript describes as book ii., and presents as a connected whole with capitular divisions, only cc. 1–25 can claim to be the original book designed by Constantine and announced in his preface. The rest is a miscellany of various documents, some perfectly irrelevant and extraneous, some more or less closely connected with the subject, others loosely hanging on to its outskirts.

§ 8. It might be thought that c. 51 should be connected with cc. 1–25, since it describes a ceremony in a similar way and is at first sight homogeneous. The lemma is of the same form:

ὅσα δεῖ παραφυλάττειν ὅταν ἐν ὀχήματι βούλεται προελθεῖν ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ἰδεῖν τὰ ὀῤῥία τοῦ στρατηγίου.

An examination of it, however, shows that it is a description not of a practice of the tenth century, but of an obsolete ceremony of the past. It belongs to an age when there was still a praetorian prefect of the east (700, 9; 701, 10, &c.) and the old organisation of the domestics and protectors still existed (700, 2–5). The decurion has prominent functions (709, 17), as in the extracts from the work of Peter the Patrician incorporated in book i.;[17] in the ceremonial of the tenth century he has no place. The function performed by the silentiarius (699, 17) is in keeping with sixth-century but not with tenth-century usage. The style of the chapter[18] corresponds to these clear indications, and there can be no doubt that it is an extract from a sixth-century work, and is

[15] Papadopulos-Kerameus, Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη, no. 39, p. 115 *sqq.*

[16] Th. Uspenski, *Vizantiiskaia tabel o rangakh*, p. 101 *sqq.*, in the 'Izviestiia russkago arkheologicheskago Instituta v Kplie,' iii. 1898.

[17] See 390, 20; 397, 17; 403, 15; 407, 21. *οἱ τριβοῦνοι τοῦ πραισέντου* (700, 1) is another indication. For the *προσκύνησις* by the domestics and protectors see 397, 7.

[18] Compare also *paratus* and *transfer*, p. 699, *loco* p. 701. So *transfer*, p. 407, 20.

homogeneous in character with book i. cc. 84–95. We must therefore place it in the same category not as ii. 1–25, but as ii. 25–39.

§ 9. Some of the documents of this miscellany, as we have just seen, are extracts from works prior to the tenth century (viz. cc. 26–37, 39, 51). Cc. 49, 50, and part of 44 (651–60, 12) are official documents of the reign of Leo VI. C. 38 and the rest of c. 44 belong to the reign of Romanus I. C. 45 is an official document of Constantine's reign, describing the Cretan expedition of A.D. 949. That c. 40 (which involves 41) was written in Constantine's reign is shown by the form of the reference to him as living (640, 3); and a definite *terminus a quo* is supplied by the mention of the fourth indiction (641, 3), which can only have been A.D. 945–6. C. 48 was compiled in the reign of Constantine VII and Romanus II (686, 23 and *passim*); and there is no reason to dissociate cc. 46, 47.

§ 10. There are only two chapters containing indications which point to a later date than the reign of Constantine. In c. 42 among the tombs at the Holy Apostles', is mentioned that of Constantine himself, and in another place the same emperor is referred to as deceased. But these passages do not justify the conclusion, which is generally drawn, that the chapter, as a whole, dates from a period subsequent to Constantine.

643, 7. ἐν ᾧ ἀπόκειται Λέων ὁ ἀοίδιμος σὺν τῷ υἱῷ Κωνσταντίνῳ ὕστερον τελευτήσαντι τῷ Πορφυρογεννήτῳ.

649, 1. Ζωὴ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ θεοστέπτου καὶ Πορφυρογεννήτου τοῦ μακαρίου βασιλέως τοῦ ἐγγόνου Βασιλείου.

In the first passage the addition τελευτήσαντι is without a parallel in the rest of the chapter, and obviously shows that the words were written not long after Constantine's death. But if the whole chapter had been written then—say, in the reign of Romanus II—the writer must have said ἀρτίως, not ὕστερον. ὕστερον has no point in the sentence as it stands. It is impossible to suppose that 'subsequently to the death of Leo VI' can be meant.[19] The only supposition which explains ὕστερον is that the chapter was compiled by Constantine, and that the clause σὺν τῷ υἱῷ—Πορφυρογεννήτῳ was interpolated, or added in the margin, after his death. Thus ὕστερον becomes perfectly intelligible. The clause means, 'Constantine himself, who wrote all this, died *since*, and was buried with his fathers.'

In the second passage τοῦ μακαρίου βασιλέως similarly stamps itself as an addition. Anyone writing the *whole* sentence would not have used this form of words. He would have said, τοῦ μακαρίου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ πορφυρογεννήτου, or something of the kind. The

[19] Rambaud, *op. cit.* p. 133, translates erroneously 'enseveli, longtemps après son père, dans le même tombeau.'

epithet *θεοστέπτου* suggests a living sovran. We may conclude that Constantine himself wrote *Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ θεοστέπτου καὶ πορφυρογεννήτου, τοῦ ἐγγόνου Βασιλείου*, and that *τοῦ μακαρίου βασιλέως* was inserted by the same hand which added the notice of his sepulture.

It is to be observed that throughout the enumeration of the tombs emperors are designated only by their names and the distinguishing epithets necessary to identify them (e.g. the two Justinians are distinguished as *μέγας* and *μικρός*; Theodora, wife of Theophilus, by her official epithet *μακαρία*). The sole exceptions to this rule are Basil I and Leo VI. Basil is described as *τοῦ φιλοχρίστου δεσπότου* (648, 12, 17, 24); Leo is *ὁ κῦρις Λέων ὁ βασιλεύς* (643, 2), *τοῦ κυροῦ Λέοντος* (*ibid.* 15),[20] *τοῦ μακαρίου Λέοντος* (*ibid.* 11, 17). This exceptional treatment conforms to the regular practice, which marks the writings of Constantine VII, of speaking of his father and grandfather with formal respect—'his majesty Basil,' 'his late majesty Leo.'

The form of the two interpolations can leave no doubt that they were added at no very long period after Constantine's death. If they were added after the death of Romanus II one would suppose that the interpolator would have also inserted a notice of that emperor's tomb.[21] It is possible that such a notice was added, for there is a brief lacuna after 643, 22;[22] but this question must be left open. In any case such a late date as the reign of Constantine VIII, suggested by Rambaud, is quite inconsistent with the character of the references to Constantine VII. Rambaud assumed, with Reiske, that the words *Βασίλειος ὁ ἀδελφὸς Κωνσταντίνου Πορφυρογεννήτου* (643, 19) could only refer to Basil II, brother of Constantine VIII.[23] Basil II (whom one might expect to find distinguished as *Βουλγαροκτόνος*, if the reference were to him) was buried, as Reiske pointed out, in the church of St. John the Evangelist at Hebdomon.[24] (There is undoubtedly some corruption in the words which immediately follow: *καὶ Βάρδας ὁ υἱὸς Βασιλείου τοῦ πάππου αὐτοῦ*—for Basil I had no son named Bardas: should it be Stephanos?—but *αὐτοῦ* evidently refers to Constantine VII.) I suggest that this *Βασίλειος*, 'brother of Constantine Porphyrogennetos,' was the son of Leo VI by Eudocia, who died in infancy.[25]

[20] Constantine speaks of the recent emperors, Leo and Romanus I, as *κῦρις*, gen. *κυροῦ*, in *De Adm. Imp.* 200, 4, 18, 201, 4, &c.

[21] Recorded in the lists of tombs printed in Banduri, *Imperium Orientale*, i. 121. More will be said of this below, § 15.

[22] Cf. Reiske, p. 766.

[23] Rambaud, *op. cit.* p. 133. This is the only ground for the view that the greater part of book ii. was compiled in the time of Constantine VIII (p. 136).

[24] *Theoph. Contin.* vi. c. 17, p. 364.

[25] Cedrenus, ii. 480; Reiske, p. 764. The objection to identifying this Basil with Basil II, furnished by the positive evidence of Cedrenus, is reinforced by the following

The conclusion is that c. 42 was compiled in the reign of Constantine VII, and that two interpolations were added, not many years after his death, in the reign of his son or of Nicephorus Phocas. It will be shown below (§ 15) that this conclusion is supported by certain marks of Constantinian compilation; and it may also be remarked that, as we otherwise know, Constantine took a particular interest in the church of the Holy Apostles, which his grandfather Basil I had restored.[26] It was in obedience to his wish that Constantine of Rhodes wrote a description of the church in iambic trimeters, which has been published from a manuscript preserved in the Laura of Mount Athos.[27] It was written between 931 and 944 A.D.,[28] and the emperor Constantine's interest in the church is emphasised in the lines (430-1)—

καὶ τὸν φαεινὸν καὶ σεβάσμιον δόμον
αὐτῶν γεραίρει καὶ ποθεῖ ξενοτρόπως.

§ 11. The other passage which contains marks of a later date than Constantine's reign is the last section of c. 55. This section is entitled *περὶ συνηθειῶν τῶν πραιποσίτων ἐν τῇ τάξει τοῦ ἱπποδρομίου*, and in Reiske's text is numbered as a separate chapter (56). It is on the last folio of the manuscript, which is mutilated (as we saw) and terminates in the middle of a sentence. In this section the following words occur:

καὶ γὰρ ὡς ἀπὸ παλαιοῦ ἐκράτει ἡ συνήθεια, ἐξηύρηται δὲ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπί τε Ἰωσὴφ πραιποσίτου τοῦ γέροντος καὶ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ οἷς καὶ ἐπέπρακτο.

Joseph, the praepositus, is manifestly Joseph Bringas, patrician and praepositus, who held successively the posts of sakellarios and *δρουγγάριος τῶν πλοΐμων* under Constantine VII,[29] who on his death-bed intrusted Romanus II to his care.[30] Under Romanus, who appointed him parakoimomenos, he was the most influential member of the administration (as *παραδυναστεύων*), and guided the counsels of the emperor.[31] The accession of Nicephorus Phocas (A.D. 963) meant his fall,[32] and he was banished to Paphlagonia.

consideration: It is highly improbable that Basil II would have been simply described as the 'brother of Constantine' in any other reign than that of Constantine VIII; but it is also highly improbable that a writer of that time, in the three years after Basil's death (1025-8), would have designated him baldly as Βασίλειος, without the addition of *ὁ μακάριος* or something of the kind.

[26] *Theoph. Contin.* ('Vita Basilii,' c. 80), p. 323.

[27] By Legrand, with commentary by Th. Reinach, in *Revue des études grecs*, ix. 32 *sqq.* 1896. An edition by Begleri was also published at Odessa in 1896.

[28] When four *βασιλεῖς* were reigning, vv. 22-6.

[29] *Theoph. Contin.* p. 445.

[30] *Ibid.* p. 466.

[31] *Ibid.* pp. 469, 474, 479, 480. The contrast between the favourable treatment of Joseph in this work and the disfavour shown to him in the chronicle of Skylitzes (Cedrenus) is marked.

[32] Leo Diaconus, p. 31 *sqq.*; Skylitzes-Cedrenus, ii. 350-1. We have a contemporary account in the relation of the *ἀναγόρευσις* of Nicephorus, added to book i. of the *De Cerimoniis* (c. 96).

The form of the reference to Joseph in the sentence above quoted gives the impression that it was written after his fall, but not at a very much later period. He is not designated as ὁ γέρων in any of our other sources, and it is natural to conjecture that this was the familiar way in which he was spoken of by his contemporaries in the reigns of Romanus II and Nicephorus.

Further on, however, in this document (807, 23) we read χαυνότητι τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα πραιποσίτων, and Reiske, referring μετὰ ταῦτα to the days of Joseph, draws the conclusion : [33]

debet codex hic ceremonialis multum aetate Constantini Porphyrogenneti senioris et Nicephori Phocae posterior esse.

Even if this explanation of μετὰ ταῦτα is correct Reiske's inference—*multum posterior*—is not necessitated, for the πραιπόσιτοι were a body, and the period of their 'negligence' might have lasted only a short time, within the reign of Nicephorus. But it is important to understand the character of our document, as a whole, which Reiske has not considered. It has the authoritative character of an order, written by the direction of an emperor, to reform an abuse which had crept in. It begins in the fashion of an imperial constitution:

ἐπειδήπερ πᾶσιν πρόκεινται ἡ τῆς τερπνῆς ἱπποδρομίας χαρμόσυνος θέα καὶ ἀκριβὴς τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ διαφόρων τάξεων ἐνάρμοστος χωρία (*leg.* χορεία) καὶ σύμπνοια, δεῖ πάντως καὶ ταύτην ἀνάγραπτον ταῖς εἰς τὸ ἑξῆς γενεαῖς καταλιπεῖν σημαίνουσαν κ.τ.λ.[34]

The special purpose of drawing up the register (ἀναγραφή), for the regulation of the τάξις τοῦ ἱπποδρομίου, was to put an end to an irregularity. The functions which properly belonged to the praepositi of administering and distributing the salaries (ῥόγαι) of the πολιτικαὶ τάξεις of the Hippodrome had been partly taken out of their hands by a conspiracy between the *chartularii* of the factions and the military treasurer (λογοθέτης τοῦ στρατιωτικοῦ), who on their own authority (χωρὶς γνώμης τῶν πραιποσίτων) nominated recipients of salaries, and of course profited by this traffic. This practice is here forbidden :

καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν δεῖ πάλιν τοῖς πραιποσίτοις ταῦτα κατέχειν καὶ διορθοῦσθαι, καὶ μηκέτι μήτε τὸν στρατιωτικὸν ἢ τοὺς χαρτουλαρίους καὶ νοταρίους ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ εἶναι κ.τ.λ.

We have clearly to do with an imperial ordinance, and in such an official document the description of Joseph as τοῦ γέροντος would be distinctly strange. This sentence referring to Joseph appears to state that the fee to the praepositi was an ancient custom, but

[33] P. 903. So Rambaud, p. 133.

[34] For the beginning, ἐπειδήπερ, cp. the novel of Basil II, Zachariä, *Ius Graeco-Romanum* iii. 308, and that of Constantine VII, *ibid.* p. 257.

was intermitted and then reintroduced by the predecessors of Joseph. If, then, the ordinance dates from a period subsequent to Joseph we have four stages in the history of the *συνήθεια*: (1) the ancient custom (2) fell wholly or partly into abeyance, (3) was renewed by Joseph's predecessors, (4) was again endangered by the usurpations of the military treasury. There is nothing impossible in this; but I do not believe that it is the right interpretation. While *τὸ γὰρ ἀκρόστιχον* (l. 14) follows on naturally to *ἀπαραλλάκτως τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τύποις ἐξακολουθοῦσιν* (l. 11) the intervening sentence (*καὶ γὰρ ὡς—ἐπέπρακτο*) comes in awkwardly. Its baldness gives it a distinct character from the rest of the document; and its tone is incongruous. The ordinance is drawn up in the interests of the praepositi, to secure them the control of the *ῥόγαι* and their due *συνήθεια*; but this sentence gives the impression that its writer was not particularly favourable to the claims of the praepositi. Besides the not very respectful designation of Joseph, the words *ἐξηύρηται* and *οἷς καὶ ἐπέπρακτο* combine to convey this impression. We seem to have to do with a marginal note, not belonging to the original text, and intended as a comment on *τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τύποις* (which is taken up by *καὶ γὰρ ὡς ἀπὸ παλαιοῦ*).[35] If so the note was evidently added after Joseph's disgrace, in the reign of Nicephorus; and the regulation itself was of older date, whether of the reign of Constantine VII or of an earlier emperor.

§ 12. We saw that the only parts of book i. which imply a date later than Constantine VII were an addition made in the reign of Nicephorus II (cc. 96, 97). An examination of book ii. has led to the result that it contains no document that need be posterior to Constantine VII, but that there are three interpolations, two in c. 42 and one in c. 55 (56), of which the last dates from the time of Nicephorus,[36] while the others might belong either to his reign or to that of Romanus II. These results mutually sustain each other, and point clearly to the conclusion that the redaction of the *De Cerimoniis*, in the form in which it has come down to us, dates from the reign of Nicephorus. There is no proof of any alterations or additions subsequent to that time.

Of what nature was this redaction? Constantine left his first book entire. Of his second book he succeeded at all events in completing a part (cc. 1–25). In the work of compilation he used a number of documents bearing on various parts of his subject, some of them describing ceremonies of a long past date. Bieliaev has well shown how such descriptions of actual ceremonies were

[35] There is no difficulty in *τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα πραιποσίτων*, 'subsequent "praepositi"' (l. 23); they are contrasted with the 'praepositi' of l. 15.

[36] If it is not admitted that this is an interpolation I contend that we must ascribe the whole document to the time of Nicephorus.

used as a basis for the prescribed ceremonies.[37] Thus the description of the reception of a deputation by Michael III in c. 37 seems to have supplied the hint for the procedure prescribed in c. 1 (522, 5 *sqq.*); and the directions in c. 14 (565) seem to be based on the ceremony described in c. 38. The reception in the Magnaura, c. 15, is based on the actual proceedings in the case of the Saracen ambassadors and the princess Olga, which are added as an appendix to this chapter. The practical use of these extracts from history, ancient as well as modern, is indicated in some of the lemmata, as in c. 31 (*πῶς δεῖ προσφέρειν τὸν βασιλέα ἐν μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναθήματα*), where the title suggests the general application of a particular ceremony performed by Michael III. To this class of documents, some of practical use, others of antiquarian interest, belong cc. 84-95 of book i. and cc. 26–39 of book ii. From the circumstance that cc. 84–95 are appended to book i. we can conclude that they were placed there by Constantine himself; for if all these documents had formed a separate *dossier* it is highly unlikely that the redactor would have inserted some of them in book i. and some of them in book ii. It seems clear that the *original compiler*, when he had completed book i., added the series of extracts from Peter as a sort of appendix. And it was because he found a series of *ἀναγορεύσεις* (91-95) at the end of book i. that the *redactor* added here (and not in book ii.) the *ἀναγόρευσις* of Nicephorus, with which he naturally associated further the ceremony of the proedros.

§ 13. It is further to be observed that cc. 26–39 of book ii. form a homogeneous series, whereas the rest of the book is a miscellany, showing no sign of ordered arrangement. This suggests that Constantine intended this series to follow book ii., exactly as the other series followed book i. It therefore seems possible that the true book ii. is complete, cc. 1-25 forming the body of the book and cc. 26-39 an appendix of illustrative material. The upper limit of date for its composition is the autumn of the year in which Olga visited Constantinople, A.D. 957, as recorded in c. 15;[38] while the upper limit for the completion of book i. is 956, the year of the death of the patriarch Theophylactus, who is referred to as no longer alive in c. 28 (p. 160).[39]

[37] *Priemy*, pp. xxxiii–iv.

[38] The date (falsely given in the Russian chronicle as 955) can be inferred from Constantine's account, though he does not mention the indiction. Olga's audience was on Wednesday, 9 September (p. 594), and there was a banquet to which the Russian retinue was invited on Sunday, 18 October. The only years in Constantine's reign fulfilling these data are 946 and 957, of which the former is otherwise excluded. It would be unnecessary to call attention to this were it not that Rambaud (*op. cit.* p. 380) strangely says 'pas de date à tirer de *Cérém.* ii. 15,' and leaves it open whether the year was 956 or 957. The true date is now currently accepted. There are good notes on Olga's visit in Ilovaiski, *Istoriia Rossii*, i. 294-5.

[39] Book ii. c. 18 seems to have been compiled before the marriage of Romanus II

§ 14. On the other hand the incorporation of cc. 40–57 in the second book was the work of the redactor. These chapters are evidently the miscellaneous contents of a *dossier* or collection of pieces, which he found physically associated with the original manuscript of the *De Cerimoniis*. They are, in fact, literary papers of Constantine, partly excerpts, partly compositions of his own, some of which he may have intended to add to *De Cer.* book ii. (for instance, cc. 40, 43, 51[40]). The want of intelligence on the part of the redactor is apparent. The inclusion of such irrelevant documents as the schedule of the military expeditions in cc. 44, 45 shows that he had no discretion; but the inclusion of a life of Alexander and the contents of c. 57 proves that his procedure was purely mechanical. In the capitular divisions he also displays his incapacity. Thus c. 50 includes (1) a schedule of salaries of *strategoi*, and (2) a schedule of persons of certain classes exempt from, or liable to, service in military expeditions—two totally distinct subjects. On the other hand the separation of c. 53 from c. 52 is indefensible.

That a number of these diverse pieces were not merely used for consultation, but were designed for publication, whether in the *De Cerimoniis* or not, can be proved; for some of them either were compiled by Constantine or reveal his editorial hand. The formula which reveals his hand is ἰστέον ὅτι (sometimes χρὴ εἰδέναι). This formula is used uniformly throughout the treatise *De Administrando Imperio* (varied by the abbreviated ὅτι), as I have shown elsewhere.[41] (See further below, § 30.)

§ 15. This test confirms our previous result, that the enumeration of the tombs in the Holy Apostles' (c. 42) was compiled by Constantine. ἰστέον ὅτι occurs repeatedly (pp. 642, 646–9). I pointed out above that this list might be considered *à propos* of the reference to some tombs in book ii. c. 6; yet it does not seem probable that it was intended to form an addition to book ii. It followed, as we saw, a list of emperors (lost from our manuscript)[42] which, whether compiled under Constantine or not,

with Theophano. Cp. 603, 3, where only ἡ αὐγούστα (Helena) appears. In the reception of Olga Theophano appears (ἡ νύμφη).

[40] This chapter may have been already added to book ii. by Constantine himself; I have treated it as disconnected, because 26–39 are homogeneous.

[41] See my article 'The Treatise De Administrando imperio,' § 6, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, vol. xv. 1906. The formula is also used frequently in ii. cc. 1–25; and the notices in cc. 26–37 are all introduced by ἰστέον ὅτι or χρὴ εἰδέναι. It was not used in the case of a literal transcription, and we can infer that the account of the χειροτονία of Theophylactus in c. 39 is an exact copy of an account written at that time (A.D. 933).

[42] It may be observed that the list of emperors, which forms part of the Codinus collection (ed. Bekker, p. 149 *sqq.*), seems to have been originally compiled under Constantine VII. This is shown by the notice of the legislation of Romanus I (pp. 154–5), in connexion with which Constantine is described as ὁ βασιλεὺς κύριος Κ. (κύριος does not occur earlier in the list).

was doubtless a separate *opusculum*. Now we possess another enumeration of the imperial tombs, published from different manuscripts by Ducange and Banduri.[43] It differs from c. 42 in several respects. It is briefer and less correct;[44] and there are some deviations in the order. It also records the tombs of Nicephorus Phocas, Theophano, and Constantine VIII,[45] so that it must have been compiled or edited after 1028. But a comparison of the two documents shows at once that they are not independent of each other. The order is generally the same; the form of the notices is exactly the same,[46] the variations mainly consisting in omissions on the part of the writer of the list. As an example of the correspondence take the notices of the first two tombs in the 'Heroon' of Justinian.

'De Cer.' ii. 42, p. 644.	'Anonymus' (Bekker, p. 205).
Πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν κόγχην κατὰ ἀνατολὰς πρῶτος λάρναξ ἐν ᾧ ἀπόκειται τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰουστινιανοῦ, ἀπὸ λίθου ξένου καὶ ἀλλοκότου μέσην χροιὰν ἔχοντος τοῦ τε Βιθυνοῦ καὶ Χαλκηδωνί του παραπλησίως λίθῳ Ὀστρίτῃ.	λάρναξ κατὰ ἀνατολὰς ἀπὸ λίθου ξένου καὶ ἀλλοκότου μέσην χροιὰν ἔχουσα τοῦ τε Βιθυνοῦ καὶ Χαλκηδονίτου παρὰ (?) λίθου ὀστρέτου ἐν ᾗ ἀπόκειται Ἰουστινιανός.
ἕτερος λάρναξ ἀπὸ λίθου Ἱεραπολίτου ἐν ᾧ ἀπόκειται Θεοδώρα ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ μεγάλου Ἰουστινιανοῦ.	ἑτέρα λάρναξ ἀπὸ λίθου Ἱεραπολίτου ἐν ᾗ ἀπόκειται Θεοδώρα ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ.

The question to be determined is whether the work of the 'Anonymus' was derived from the Constantinian document or was based on a common source. In the latter case c. 42 would represent not an original composition, but an edition of an older work. The former alternative must be accepted, because the characteristic ἰστέον ὅτι appears in the 'Anonymus' (p. 207, 9 and 16; also 20, where the text gives εἰ δέ corruptly). Moreover the homogeneity of the Constantinian document is notable; the stone of the sarcophagus is designated throughout, whereas in the late additions of the 'Anonymus' the stone is not described (simply ἑτέρα λάρναξ).

43 Ducange, *Constantinopolis Christiana*, bk. iv. pp. 109–10; Banduri, *Imperium Orientale*, i. 121, whence it was reprinted in Bekker's *Codinus* ('Exc. de ant. Const.'), p. 202, and (with Banduri's commentary) in Migne, *P. G.* 157, c. 725 *sqq*.

44 Thus a tomb of Theodosius II is inserted after that of Theodosius I (Bekker, p. 203), and again rightly noticed in a different place along with that of Arcadius (p. 207). There is a similar duplication of Michael II (pp. 204, 206).

45 Pp. 204–5. Also of Romanus II, which may have been in *De Cer.* c. 42. Observe that Constantine VIII is described as 'the brother of the emperor Basil Bulgaroktonos,' as we should expect, and nothing is said of a tomb of Basil II, who was buried elsewhere; see above, § 10.

46 Curiously λάρναξ is masculine throughout in c. 42, but feminine, according to the commoner usage, in the anonymous list.

The 'Anonymus' has indeed one additional piece of description. It is noted that the stoa containing the tombs of Arcadius, Eudoxia, and their son is *τὰ νῦν ἀσκέπαστος* (p. 206); this is not mentioned in the Constantinian document. There are, however, certain other variations which suggest that this addition may not have been due to the 'Anonymus.'

(1) The notice of the casting out of the body of Constantine V, *ἀλλ' ἐξεώθη κ.τ.λ.* (p. 645, 4) appears in the 'Anonymus' in an expanded form (contrary to wont), and is introduced by the Constantinian formula *ἰστέον ὅτι* (p. 206), which is absent here in the Constantinian document.

(2) The last part of the Constantinian document (647, 20–649, 6) is omitted in the 'Anonymus.' This does not prove that the anonymous list was left incomplete, for this omitted portion records the tombs of minor members of imperial houses, *ἐν τῷ εὐωνύμῳ μέρει τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίας.* No emperor was buried in this part of the church, and therefore a list of imperial tombs might have been composed without including it.

It seems, then, worth while to suggest that the work was issued in Constantine's lifetime without this latter portion, and differing in a few details from the generally fuller draft in c. 42; and that it was from this publication that the anonymous list was transcribed. The only objection to this hypothesis is that the tomb of the empress regent Zoe was in the omitted portion, and it may be asked whether Constantine would have allowed a description to appear which did not include his mother's tomb. In any case it seems highly probable that the document of c. 42 was intended to be an independent work by itself.

§ 16. It has already been observed (§ 6) that the list of *ἀλλάξιμα* in c. 41 belongs to, and should not have been separated from, the lists which form the latter part of c. 40. On the other hand c. 40 comprises two heterogeneous documents, (*a*) the account of the origin of the ceremony of the twelve *λῶροι* and (*b*) the lists of church treasures. The division between cc. 40 and 41 ought to have been at the end of *a*. We saw that *b* contains internal evidence of its compilation in the reign of Constantine (above, § 9); but it does not seem at all probable that he intended to append it to the *De Cerimoniis*. On the other hand *a* has no special marks of Constantinian origin, and the introductory sentence is unlike the general style of the *De Cerimoniis*.[47] It must be left open whether it was compiled by Constantine or is an extract from some older work. In any case it is closely connected with the subject of the *De Cerimoniis*, and would have formed a suitable adjunct to the treatise.

[47] *ἐκ μὲν τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς νοημάτων τῆς εὐσεβείας, καθὼς ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος, ὑποτυπώσομαι.* In the prefaces Constantine does not use the first singular.

That the εὐφημία on the occasion of a triumph (c. 43) was meant to be incorporated somewhere is shown by the emperor's ἰστέον ὅτι ἡ αὐτὴ εὐφημία ᾄδεται κ.τ.λ. (p. 649, 9). It would have been quite a relevant addition to book ii.

The two documents combined in c. 44, relating to the expeditions to Crete under Leo VI, and to Italy under Romanus I, bear the marks of Constantine's editing (ἰστέον ὅτι pp. 656–7 repeatedly, 660, 662; also ὅτι 663). And in the similar document of his own reign we also find the characteristic mark (669, 12, 671, 18). These pieces have nothing to do with ceremonies; their proper place would be in a treatise on military and naval organisation. The documents in c. 50, on the salaries of the strategoi and liability for military service, would also be appropriate in such a treatise. They too were edited by Constantine (compare 697, 10; 698, 9, 22; 699, 1). It seems a not improbable inference that he had formed the idea of compiling a treatise on military administration.

§ 17. C. 47 is distinguished by a special title in majuscules, a distinction which it shares with c. 52 (the *Kletorologion*). This indicates that the χαιρετισμοί were, like the *Kletorologion*, an independent document, and internal evidence suggests that it may have been composed in the time of Leo VI.[48] C. 48 seems also to be an older document, in which the names of Constantine and Romanus have been substituted in the formulae for those of earlier emperors. I conclude this from the retention of an obsolete formula for addressing the prince of Bulgaria side by side with the new form of address.[49] Further traces of Constantine's editing appear at p. 688, 16, and in the scholia on pp. 690 and 686.

The schedule of fees, dating from Leo's reign, in c. 49 has no signs of Constantine's hand, but it is followed by notices relating to (1) subsidies and exemptions granted to Saracen captives who have become Christians and (2) the property of soldiers, which ought not to have been grouped either together or in the same chapter as the schedule. These notices are marked by the usual Constantinian formula.

The *Kletorologion* of Philotheos, cc. 52, 53, with its appendix, 54, is intact; there are no notes or additions of Constantine. The schedule of c. 55 is introduced by the Constantinian formula.

§ 18. Sorting these documents in accordance with our results,

[48] It looks as if the Bulgarian formulae on p. 681 were used in the first years of Leo, during Vladimir's reign (the emperor is πάππος because Vladimir was son of Boris), and as if those following on p. 682 (μεταμειφθέντος τοῦ ὀνόματος) were introduced after the accession of Symeon (A.D. 893). Cf. Reiske, p. 801.

[49] P. 690. The first formula represents evidently the later usage of Leo's reign (see last note), while the second, in which the Bulgarian ruler is entitled κύριος and βασιλεύς, must have been introduced when the tsar Peter married Maria, granddaughter of Romanus I.

we may draw up the following table of the contents of the collection known as *De Cerimoniis* :—

A. *Treatise 'De Cerimoniis :'*

Book i.=i. cc. 1–83 (92 *)+84–95 (93 *–104 *) [84–95 contain matter which a modern author might include in an appendix].

Book ii.=ii. cc. 1–25+26–40*a* [26–40*a* contain matter of the nature of an appendix. 51 seems also to belong to this series]. It is possible that 43, 48 (and 46) were intended to be incorporated.

Subsequent addition in the reign of Nicephorus Phocas=i. 96, 97 (105,* 106 *).

B. *Various opuscula composed or edited by Constantine VII :*

(1) περὶ τῶν τάφων τῶν βασιλέων=ii. 42.

(2) Military documents, perhaps for a treatise on military administration=ii. 44, 45, 50, and latter part of 49 (694, 22–end).

(3) χαιρετισμοί of ambassadors=ii. 47, with which perhaps 46 and 48 are connected.

(4) Schedule of συνήθειαι=ii. 55 (with Reiske's 56).

? (5) List of emperors=ii. 42 in index. But, as this is lost, we cannot say whether it belongs here or under C.

C. *Additions, not written or edited by Constantine VII :*

(1) Kletorologion of Philotheos=ii. 52, 53 (with its appendix 54).

(2) Schedule of fees in reign of Leo VI=ii. 49 (beginning-694, 21).

(3) Life of Alexander of Macedon=ii. 56 (lost).

(4) Documents of ii. 57 (lost).

(As the most simple explanation of the appearance of the accretions B and C it is suggested that they were found in a *dossier* of Constantine along with material connected with the Ceremonies.)

J. B. Bury.

(*To be continued.*)

The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogennetos (Continued)

Author(s): J. B. Bury

Source: *The English Historical Review*, Jul., 1907, Vol. 22, No. 87 (Jul., 1907), pp. 417-439

Published by: Oxford University Press

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/549919

The English Historical Review

NO. LXXXVII.—JULY 1907 *

The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogennetos

II. The Ecclesiastical Ceremonies of Book I.

§ 19. In book i., cc. 1–83, Rambaud discovered *une unité remarquable*. He believed that these chapters were mainly composed in the reign of Constantine VII, only allowing that some had been originally compiled 'in the time of Leo VI, or Alexander, or Romanus Lecapenus.'[1] The researches of Bieliaev have definitely shown that this view is not tenable. It is, in fact, inconsistent with Constantine's explicit statement, which shows that he mainly confined himself to the mechanical work of arranging in a logical order and series pre-existing materials.[2]

Book i. (omitting the appendix, cc. 84–97) falls into two parts:
A. cc. 1–37 (properly 1–46*) : Church ceremonies and processions.
B. cc. 38–83 (properly *47–92*) : Secular ceremonies.

Bieliaev's investigation (*Priemy*) is devoted to A. It is his great merit to have shown that this first portion consists of two distinct series, and to have deduced an important inference. The first series, of which the latter part is lost, corresponds to cc. 1–17*; it gives the general order of the processional ceremonial on great church festivals and the acta of the factions on these occasions.

[1] *Op. cit.* pp. 131–2. He uses the word *rédigés*; his argument shows that he means 'put together' or 'composed,' not 'transcribed.'

[2] See the preface to book ii. p. 516, cc. 5–11, especially ἡμετέραις ἐπιμελείαις φιλοπόνως συναθροισθέντα.

The second series, of which the beginning is lost, corresponds to cc. 18*–46*, and contains descriptions of the special ceremonies for special feasts.

FIRST SERIES.

C. 1. The general order of the ceremonial at any great church festival on which the emperors visit St. Sophia. The ceremonial on Christmas Day is taken as a model.[3] There are added notices of (1) special modifications on Easter Day, p. 22, 12– ; (2) the ceremonial on the Nativity of the Virgin, p. 26, 12–, which holds for the Annunciation, p. 33, 3, and partly for (3) the procession of Easter Saturday, but with modifications, p. 33, 11–.

Cc. 2–9. The Ἄκτα τῶν μερῶν on the chief festivals from (c. 2) Christmas to (c. 9, down to p. 61, 5) Pentecost.

Cc. *10–17*. These lost chapters undoubtedly contained the Ἄκτα for festivals between Pentecost and Christmas. Bieliaev has discussed what they were.[4] Five may be considered almost certain: All Saints, the Holy Apostles, the Transfiguration, the Nativity of the Virgin, the Assumption.

SECOND SERIES.

Cc. *18–44* (= c. 9 from p. 61, 5–c. 35).[5] Ceremonies on church feasts beginning with Easter Day, ending with Easter Eve.

[Cc. 36 and 37 are additions which do not form part of this series. C. 36 is a note on certain peculiarities of the προέλευσις in commemoration of the union of the church;[6] c. 37 describes how the emperors change their attire on various church feasts.]

§ 20. Comparing these two series of ceremonies, we observe two significant facts. (1) In both cases the festivals of the ecclesiastical year are treated in chronological order, but they begin at different points of the cycle. The first series begins with Christmas, the second with Easter. (2) The second series is not merely supplementary to the first. It presents both repetitions of and divergencies from the descriptions in c. 1. For instance, compare the Christmas Day ceremonies of c. 23 with the proceedings described in c. 1. Again, in the ceremony of the Annunciation (c. 30) the emperor at one point *ἀνέρχεται διὰ τῆς ξυλίνης σκάλας ἐν τοῖς κατηχουμενείοις* (p. 166, 22); but at the end of this chapter it is noted that this part of the programme has been altered, and that the emperor *οὐκ ἀνέρχεται νυνὶ ἐν τοῖς κατηχουμενείοις ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν τροπικὴν ἑστὼς τῆς ἁγίας σοροῦ κ.τ.λ.*

[3] This follows, as Bieliaev has pointed out, from 1, 9, p. 63, where Constantine evidently designates the description in c. 1 as a description of the procession on Christmas Day: ὃν τρόπον ἀνωτέρω ἐν τῇ καθόλου προελεύσει τῆς Χριστοῦ γεννήσεως ἐξεθέμεθα.

[4] *Priemy*, pp. 38-40, note 2. In his argument he makes use of data offered by c. 37 and book ii. c. 52.

[5] I designate by 9*b* the part of c. 9 which belongs to the original c. 18*.

[6] Cp. Bieliaev, *Priemy*, pp. 235-6.

(p. 169, 22). In the account in c. 1 we find the second custom established, and there is no reference to the older practice (p. 31, 14).[7]

From these observations Bieliaev has justly inferred[8] that the compiler (Constantine) had before him two different sets of material. Series 2 does not represent a number of isolated descriptions which were first collected and arranged by him. It represents an older collection, which he took over, not altering its arrangement, and only inserting occasional notes to point out modifications which had been made since the date when it had been originally compiled. On the other hand series 1 represents the actual practice of Constantine's time; there are no mentions of alteration in procedure. All the chapters of this series are appropriate to the last years of Constantine's reign. The acta in cc. 2 *sqq.* contemplate more than one Augusta (Helena and Theophano) and the princesses, Constantine's daughters (*τὰ πορφυρογέννητα*).[9]

§ 21. It will be well to enumerate the proofs which corroborate the inference that series 2 is older than series 1. I have already drawn attention to (1) the passage in c. 23 which records a change of procedure. (2) at the close of c. 10, p. 85, 24, we find the following important text:

> *ἰστέον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ὅτι ἐπὶ Λέοντος τοῦ τῆς θείας λήξεως ἐγένετο ἡ τάξις αὕτη. ἱππεύει ὁ βασιλεὺς κ.τ.λ. . . . καὶ τελεῖται οὕτως ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας.*

The change here described was made by Leo VI; it follows that the preceding description of the Easter Monday ceremonies con-

[7] This is in the description of the ceremonies of the Nativity of the Virgin, but it is stated that the order for the Annunciation was the same (p. 33, 2).

[8] *Priemy*, pp. xxxvii–viii.

[9] In c. 1, p. 19, the editor has added a note in regard to the apokombion presented to the patriarch. It is mutilated, but it clearly tells what is to be done in four different cases, according as there are one, two, three, or more emperors. Bieliaev restores thus (*Priemy*, p. 184): *ἰστέον ὅτι ὀφείλει ἔχειν τὸ ἀποκόμβιον χρυσοῦ λίτρας ι', καὶ εἰ μὲν ἔστιν εἷς βασιλεὺς, δίδωσι τὰς ι' λίτρας, εἰ δὲ δύο εἰσὶν εἴτε καὶ γ' εἰσὶν μερίζονται αἱ δέκα λίτραι. εἰσὶ δ' εἰ καὶ γ' πλὴν τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως, ὀφείλει εἶναι ταὐτὸ τὸ ποσὸν τοῦ διδομένου ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν δεσποτῶν ἐξίσης, ὡς συμπληροῦσθαι διὰ τῶν ἀμφοτέρων τὰς δέκα λίτρας.* Constantine VII had personally experienced five different cases: (1) he had reigned alone, before the elevation of Romanus I and for a few months at the beginning of A.D. 945; (2) he had one colleague, Romanus I, before the elevation of Christophoros; and afterwards Romanus II; (3) he had two colleagues, Romanus I and Christophoros, before the elevation of Stephen and Constantine; (4) he had four colleagues after the elevation of Stephen and Constantine; (5) he had three colleagues after the death of Christophoros. It is clear that in enumerating the various cases he is thinking of what happened in his own experience. Bieliaev's restoration does not include the case of five emperors; why should it be omitted? Further, Bieliaev's *εἰσὶ δ' εἰ καὶ γ'* cannot be right. Reiske gives *ε . . εἰ καὶ γ'*. I would restore *εἰ δὲ δ' ἢ εἰ καὶ γ'*. Though we might expect *γ'* to precede *δ'*, the motive for the reverse order is furnished by the chronology: there were five basileis before there were four.

tained in c. 10 was composed before that change. (3) In the account of the ceremonies on the Sunday after Easter (c. 16) we find a marginal note recording a recent change (p. 98, 22) of the same kind as that noticed in the case of Easter Monday. Instead of proceeding on foot to St. Sophia the emperor rides to the church of the Holy Apostles. A posterior limit of date for the changes is supplied[10] by the 'Kletorologion' of Philotheos (composed A.D. 900); for there we find that in both cases the new order was already in force (pp. 769, 1, and 773, 1). As there can be little doubt that the same emperor, Leo VI, who made the alteration for Easter Monday made the corresponding alteration for the ensuing Sunday, we get as the time limits for these changes 886–900 A.D. (4) The ceremonies of the Feast of Orthodoxy are described in c. 28, but we are told at the end that this description is partly antiquated: *ἰστέον ὅτι τὸ παλαιὸν ὁ τοιοῦτος τύπος ἦν· νῦν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς κ.τ.λ.* (p. 159, 21).

There are some other indications bearing on the date of the ceremonies of series 2. We learn from a note to c. 19 that the feast of St. Elias *ἐκαινουργήθη ἐπὶ Βασιλείου τοῦ φιλοχρίστου.* Candles were lit in front of Basil's icon (p. 118, 1), *ἅπτουσι κηροὺς εἰς τὴν εἰκόνα Βασιλείου τοῦ φιλοχρίστου δεσπότου.* The concluding *troparion* of the lamplight service (*τὸ λυχνικόν*) on the eve of this feast was composed by *Λέων ὁ σοφώτατος καὶ ἀγαθὸς βασιλεύς.* We can conclude that this chapter dates (in its present form; see below, § 26) from the reign of Leo VI. We can draw the same conclusion in regard to c. 20, containing the ceremonies in commemoration of the dedication of the New Great Church, built by Basil I and dedicated to Christ, the archangel Michael, and Elias.[11] Here too we have a similar note stating that the feast was founded by Basil (p. 118), and in this ceremony also candles are lit before the icon of that emperor (p. 121, 3). These two ceremonies (cc. 19 and 20) were clearly inaugurated at the same time. The principal part of the former was celebrated in the New Great Church. The account of the celebration of the feast of St. Demetrius in c. 21 seems also to have been composed in the reign of Leo VI; a *troparion* composed by *Λέων ὁ σοφώτατος καὶ ἀγαθὸς βασιλεὺς* was recited (p. 123, 23).

§ 22. It does not appear to have been observed that in the ceremony of St. Basil's Day (1 January) we have a date which is precise but ambiguous. C. 24, p. 137, 16: *συνέβη δὲ καὶ τοῦτο γενέσθαι τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἰνδικτιῶνι γ′.* The third indiction might be A.D. 885 in Basil's reign, or A.D. 900 in Leo's. Bulgarian ambassadors were present, and took part in the celebration; we

[10] Bieliaev, *Priemy*, p. 231.

[11] The church is described by Constantine VII in his 'Life of Basil' (*Theoph. Contin.* p. 325 *sqq.*)

learn that this was customary since the conversion of Bulgaria (*τοὺς φίλους Βουλγάρους τοὺς κατὰ τύπον ἐρχομένους κ.τ.λ.*, p. 139, 1). The practice must, of course, have been intermitted during the war between Symeon and Leo, but this war was over before A.D. 900, so that this does not help us to decide between the two dates. There is however another *datum* which enables us, I think, to decide for the later year. The client archon of Taro is received by the emperors. He is described as *τὸν μάγιστρον καὶ ἄρχοντα τοῦ Ταρῶ* (p. 138, 12) and *ὁ μάγιστρος ὁ Ταρωνίτης* (p. 139, 18). Now we know that Krikorikios, the archon of Taro, was obliged by Leo VI to come to Constantinople, when the emperor conferred upon him the dignity of *magister*.[12] This Taronite ruler was the first to submit to the power of Constantinople.[13] Hence the chapter cannot be earlier than Leo's reign; and the third indiction must be A.D. 900.

§ 23. The ceremony (c. 17) on Wednesday in the fourth week in Easter (*μεσοπεντηκοστῇ*), which was marked by a *προέλευσις* to the church of St. Mokios, also suggests chronological considerations. On the occasion of this ceremony an attempt was made on the life of Leo VI in that church, and in consequence he discontinued this *προέλευσις*.[14] Our sources do not directly furnish the date, though they imply that the incident occurred after the elevation of Nikolaos to the patriarchate (February 901) and before 906.[15] But they furnish data which enable us to fix the year. We are told that Marcus, steward of the church of St. Mokios, attempted to persuade the emperor to revoke his decision to discontinue the ceremony. On Leo's refusal Marcus prophesied that his reign would last ten years: *ὃ καὶ γέγονεν· μετὰ γὰρ τὴν ἐκπλήρωσιν τῶν δέκα ἐνιαυτῶν, τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἐπλήγη, τετελεύτηκεν.*[16] As Leo died in 912 Krug inferred [17] that the attempt on his life occurred in 902. This is simple, but it will hardly do; it does not explain the story. The prophecy was naturally *post eventum*; there is not a word about it in our only contemporary source, the *Vita Euthymii*, where the circumstances of the murderous assault are more fully narrated than elsewhere.[18] The *motif* of the story is at once apparent when we observe that the day of Leo's death

[12] Constantine Porph. *De Adm. Imp.* c. 43, p. 185: *εἰσελθόντος τοῦ αὐτοῦ Κρικορικίου ἐν τῇ θεοφυλάκτῳ πόλει καὶ τῇ τοῦ μαγίστρου καὶ στρατηγοῦ Ταρῶν ἀξίᾳ τιμηθέντος. . . . καὶ ἐπὶ χρόνον ἐν τῇ βασιλευούσῃ διατρίψας κ.τ.λ.* Thus *De Cer.* c. 24 furnishes a date for the narrative in *De Adm. Imp.* c. 43.

[13] *Ibid.* p. 182, 12.

[14] *Theoph. Contin.* p. 365 = *Logothete* (Georg. Mon. Contin., ed. Bonn), pp. 861–2 = Theodosius Melit. pp. 192–3 = Leo Gramm. pp. 275–6. *ἔκτοτε δὲ ἡ τοιαύτη ἐξεκόπη προέλευσις.*

[15] Cp. *Vita Euthymii*, ed. De Boor, p. 34, 27; 35, 6; 37, 15.

[16] *Theoph. Contin.* p. 366.

[17] *Kritischer Versuch*, p. 40 *sqq.* Bieliaev adopts this date (*Priemy*, p. 232).

[18] Cap. 11, p. 35.

was 11 May, and that Mid-Pentecost fell on 11 May in the year 903. This is quite sufficient to fix the date; the odd coincidence explains the origin of the story, in which the dissatisfaction of the clergy of St. Mokios is also reflected. De Boor also arrives at this date for the attempt, though by a somewhat different method.[19] The 'ten' years instead of 'nine' cannot weigh against the consideration adduced. De Boor contemplates the possibility of a scribe's error; [20] but his suggestion that the original source may have had 'in the tenth year' sounds more likely. The day of Leo's demise was the tenth anniversary of the attempt on his life, and the conventional value of the number ten is sufficient to account for the strain here put upon inclusive reckoning.

The account seems to imply that the visit to St. Mokios on Mid-Pentecost was not re-established in Leo's time; and thus we obtain A.D. 903 as a posterior limit of date for c. 17. Bieliaev has ingeniously attempted to determine a prior limit. We have seen that on the first Sunday after Easter a προέλευσις to the Holy Apostles was introduced by Leo VI instead of a προέλευσις to St. Sophia. But the προέλευσις to St. Sophia had itself superseded an older practice. When the account (c. 64) of the imperial visit to the Golden Hippodrome on the Monday after the first Sunday after Easter was composed, the προέλευσις on that Sunday was not to St. Sophia but to St. Mokios.[21] There is evidence to which I will refer below (§ 34) that this account cannot be later than the first years of Basil I. Now we know that the church of St. Mokios had partly fallen in and was restored by Basil.[22] Hence Bieliaev argues that it was Basil, the restorer of the church, who transferred the visit to St. Mokios from the Sunday after Easter to Mid-Pentecost, and concludes that the accounts of both these ceremonies, in cc. 16, 17, were drafted in the reign of Basil.[23] The argument in itself does not appear to be cogent. It depends on the assumption that there could not have been προελεύσεις to this church on two festivals; and for this assumption there is no evidence. Again, the argument implies that the shattered condition of the church did not hinder the προέλευσις on the Sunday after Easter. It must therefore be admitted that it does not afford a ground for denying that the προέλευσις at Mid-Pentecost to the same church might be a practice of earlier date than the reign of Basil. Bieliaev's view, therefore, cannot be considered as more than a conjecture; and we shall presently see that it involves difficulties.

[19] *Vita Euthymii*, pp. 110–2.

[20] η for ι, on the supposition that the alleged interview between Marcus and Leo occurred shortly before Mid-Pentecost 904. It seems to me that in the case of such a story we miss the mark if we go so far in requiring internal chronological consistency. De Boor bases too much on his discrimination between the date of the attempt and the date (μετά τινα καιρόν) of the supposed conversation.

[21] C. 64, p. 284. [22] *Theoph. Contin.* p. 323. [23] *Priemy*, pp. 232–3.

§ 24. Besides these explicit indications of date, which occur in the Second Series, we have another means of discrimination. We find that some ceremonies contemplate one *βασιλεύς* only, and others more than one. In the first place this criterion confirms the distinction between the two series. The ceremonies of the first group all alike contemplate the presence of more than one emperor (*οἱ δεσπόται*). The ceremonies of the second group vary. The greater number of them imply only one emperor (*ὁ βασιλεύς*), a few make mention of more than one.

Rambaud, who observed this difference but did not examine the data closely, concluded (in accordance with his general view of the work) that the ceremonies in which only one emperor appears belong to the period when Constantine VII reigned without a colleague, before the coronation of his son Romanus. This period however lasted for little over three months (27 January–6 April 945), and the ceremonies in question are numerous; so that, as Bieliaev observes, this consideration alone is sufficient to rule out Rambaud's hypothesis.[24]

The distinction between the two groups established by the Russian scholar, and the clear evidence that the second group is older and belongs to the Basil-Leo period, have put the question in a new light. Bieliaev concludes that the oldest descriptions, in which only one emperor appears, belong to the early years of Basil I, but allows that some of them may have been drawn up in the reign of Michael III.[25] But in arguing that the single basileus represents, as a rule, Basil I, he fails to notice that this involves a difficulty very similar to that which he urged himself against the view of Rambaud. For Basil was not sole reigning emperor for much longer than a year. His predecessor was assassinated in September 867, and in the course of 868 he conferred the imperial dignity on his son Constantine. On 6 January 870 there was a third colleague, his second son, Leo.[26] The hypothesis therefore implies that all these ceremonies (and there are others among the secular ceremonies which must be taken into account) were drafted during the first year of Basil's reign. This of course is not impossible, but the chronological facts at least do not encourage us to prefer the claim of Basil to that of Michael III.[27]

§ 25. I called attention above (§ 23) to the conjecture of Bieliaev that Basil I discontinued the visit to St. Mokios on the

[24] He admits however that some chapters may have been borrowed from older books.

[25] *Priemy*, pp. xl, xli.

[26] Mansi, *Conc.* xvi. 143, 'imperii Basilii quidem ac Constantini a. 3, Leonis vero anno 1, ind. 3 pridie Idus Februarii.'

[27] For notices of ceremonies in the reign of Michael see *De Cer.* 2, cc. 31, 32, 34, 36, 37.

Sunday after Easter, substituted a visit to St. Sophia, and introduced the visit to St. Mokios at Mid-Pentecost; whence he infers that cc. 16 and 17 were drafted in this reign. He has failed to observe that the criterion which is under consideration separates these chapters in time. C. 17 contemplates δεσπόται, c. 18 only one βασιλεύς. This deprives the conjecture of its plausibility. Its essence is the hypothesis that the two changes are interdependent and simultaneous; and (in default of an express record) the only cogent evidence would be the intimate connexion and synchronism of these two chapters. It is to be noted that Bieliaev's argument implies that St. Mokios was restored in the first year of Basil, since *ex hypothesi* the restoration preceded the new arrangement, and c. 18 must have been drafted before the coronation of Constantine. My conclusion would be that c. 17 belongs either to the reign of Basil (during the greater part of which there were more than one emperor) or to the first half of the reign of Leo VI, and that there is no ground for excluding the reign of Michael III as the possible date of c. 18.

The application of the criterion βασιλεύς: δεσπόται requires however some precaution. Thus in the short chapter 36, on the προέλευσις ἑνώσεως ἐκκλησίας, only one βασιλεύς appears. It would nevertheless be indiscreet to infer that it was composed when only one βασιλεύς was reigning. This chapter has been judiciously discussed by Bieliaev.[28] The festival of the Henosis of the church was founded to celebrate the end of the troubles consequent upon the fourth marriage of Leo VI, in A.D. 920, before the coronation of Romanus I (not in A.D. 921).[29] Hence it might be supposed that this chapter was composed in 920, between July, the month of the Henosis, and 17 December, the date of the coronation of Romanus, since at that time there was only one emperor, Constantine VII (aged 14). But in that case we should expect a full account of the ceremonies, whereas we get no details in the dozen lines which are here devoted to the subject; and the chapter has all the appearance of a note—introduced by the usual ἰστέον ὅτι—added by the editor to the previous chapter, and not intended to form a distinct chapter itself. This being so, if we press the fact that only one βασιλεύς is mentioned, we should have to refer this note to the few months in which Constantine reigned alone in A.D. 945. It is obvious that in the case of such a brief insertion this is unnecessary. We know that Constantine was at work on the *Ceremonies* in the last years of his reign, and in his

[28] *Priemy*, pp. 233–7.

[29] This follows from the τόμος τῆς ἑνώσεως, in the title of which Romanus is still only basileopator (Zachariä, *Ius Graeco-rom.* iii. 228). The chroniclers give A.D. 921. Cp. the *Logothete* (George Mon., ed. Bonn), p. 890; *Theoph. Contin.* p. 398. Cp. Hirsch, *Byzantinische Studien*, p. 81.

editorial additions to ceremonies in which only one basileus appeared he might very well have only taken into account the basileus who played the chief part.

But the case is not isolated. The editorial addition at the end of c. 10 mentions only *ὁ βασιλεύς*, but no one would think of pressing it. On the other hand, in the addition to c. 28, where the editor goes into details, the *δεσπόται* come in. I would call attention to this passage as instructive. The editor, having before him a description which contemplates only one basileus, begins in the same key; but once embarked he passes abruptly, even ungrammatically, into the plural (p. 159, 22 *νῦν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ἐκτελεῖ μέχρι τῆς εἰσόδου καθὼς εἴρηται. εἰς δὲ τὴν εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὸ βῆμα ἔνδον, καὶ προσκυνοῦσι κ.τ.λ.*) where we have to understand *οἱ δεσπόται*, who are not mentioned till the next sentence.

§ 26. If we analyse Series 2 by means of our criterion and exclude c. 36 as an editorial addition, we find that of the twenty-eight chapters twenty-one contemplate one basileus, namely, 10–15, 17, 18, 22, 23, 25–35; and in seven there is mention of more than one—9*b*, 16, 19–21, 24, 37. But it must not be assumed that all the ceremonies of either category were composed at the same time. I will now proceed to show that some chapters in the second category supply data (to which critics have not attended) proving that they belong to different periods.

I would observe in the first place that all the ceremonies in this category (we may leave aside c. 37, which is not a description of a ceremony) are distinguished in one respect from the ceremonies of Series 1. In c. 1 and in nearly all the acta which follow it (cc. 2–9*a*) there is explicit mention of the Augustae and the Porphyrogennetoi (e.g. pp. 36, 38, 45, 47, 60). This is a striking note of homogeneity in this series. It corresponds to the date at which we know Constantine VII was engaged on the Ceremonies, *c.* A.D. 957–9, when there were two Augustae (his wife, Helena, and his son's wife, Theophano) and several purple-born daughters. This is an observation which has not, so far as I know, been made before, but it is important.

In c. 9*b* *two* emperors are contemplated, *ὁ μέγας βασιλεύς* and *ὁ μικρός* (which simply means the junior colleague). See pp. 64, 24 ; 68, 22 ; 69, 1. This in itself would suit Constantine VII and Romanus II, but we find that there was only one Augusta (p. 67, 9), and therefore, if it belonged to this reign, we should have to place it before the marriage of Romanus II and before the composition of Series 1. The data would also suit the reign of Leo VI and Alexander.

In c. 19, on the other hand, there appear more than two emperors (*ὁ μέγας* and *οἱ μικροί*, p. 115, 16). This might suggest

the reign of Romanus I or the last years of Leo VI and Alexander (after the coronation of Constantine Porphyrogennetos); but it also corresponds to the situation in the reign of Basil I (from A.D. 870), and, as the ceremony described was instituted in his reign, we may conclude with a high probability that this was the date of the original draft, though the mention of the troparion composed by Leo, who is described as ὁ σοφώτατος καὶ ἀγαθὸς βασιλεύς, points to a redaction in his reign (cp. above, § 21). In c. 20 there is no phrase showing that there were more than two emperors; but, as we saw, it is naturally associated with c. 19, and we shall hardly be wrong in assuming the same date for its composition. It seems probable that the following chapter 21 (festival of St. Demetrius) belongs to the same group, composed in the reign of Basil and edited in the reign of Leo.[30]

Thus of the six chapters under consideration we have found reasons for concluding that 19, 20, 21 were originally drafted in the reign of Basil I, but were rehandled under Leo VI, while 24 (which I showed in § 22 must be connected with A.D. 900) belongs, and 9*b* may belong, to the reign of Leo; the short chapter 16, as we saw above (§ 21), is prior to A.D. 900.

§ 27. We may turn now to the larger group in Series 2, in which only one basileus appears. We have already seen that c. 10 was written before a certain change (recorded in an editorial note at the end of the chapter) had been made by Leo VI (see above, § 21). We are also furnished with a prior limit. The lighting of candles at the tombs of Saints Nikephoros and Methodios (p. 77, 6) shows that the description is subsequent to June 847, the date of the death of Methodios.[31] As the *motif* of this act was undoubtedly the share which these two patriarchs had taken in the

[30] It seems to me very significant for the chronological association of these three chapters that in all three the ἑταιρειάρχης appears in a part of the ceremony which is the same in all three: 116, 4– = 119, 3– = 122, 4–. We know that Stylianos (afterwards basileopator) was μικρὸς ἑταιρειάρχης under Basil. We may infer, perhaps, that there was also a μέγας ἑταιρειάρχης in this reign. See the chronicles of the 'Logothete' group (George Mon. p. 846, ed. Bonn, and the rest). In c. 21 the additions of the editor are evidently distinct. The original narrative is interrupted by inserted notes at 122, 23; it is resumed at 123, 11, and is once more interrupted at 123, 22, by an insertion, extending to 124, 3.

[31] 14 June 847 (not 846). Different views were held as to the year; but 847 is now established. The *Life of the Hermit Joannikios*, in the collection of Simeon Metaphrastes (Migne, *P. G.* 116, p. 92), states that Methodios died on 14 June, eight months after the death of Joannikios. An earlier ninth-century *Life of Joannikios*, by the Monk Sabas, was published in 1894 in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Novem. II., and there the exact date of the death of the hermit is stated (p. 433): Nov. 3 or 4, A.M 6355, indict. 10, i.e. 846. We know otherwise that Methodios was patriarch for four years and three months (*Nicephori Chron.* ed. De Boor, p. 120; four years, *Vita Ignatii*, in Migne, *P. G.* 117, p. 500, &c. &c.), so that he was appointed in March 843, which agrees with the now accepted date for the First Sunday of Orthodoxy. See on the whole question Vasil'iev, *Vizantiia i Araby*, i. pril. iii. 142–6.

struggle against iconoclasm, there is a presumption that this part of the ceremony was arranged while the memory of the triumph of A.D. 843 was still young; and we may esteem it more probable that the chapter dates from the reign of Michael III (between 848 and 866, the year of Basil's elevation) than from the first year of Basil's reign, which in the case of this ceremony would mean A.D. 868. Similarly it is natural to suppose that the description of the Feast of Orthodoxy, c. 28, was composed in the reign of Michael. We have already seen (§ 23) that the same period is not excluded for c. 17.

In the other chapters we have no chronological clues. But it is important to observe signs that they were not isolated descriptions, but formed part of a series. In c. 12 and in c. 13 there are references to c. 11 (pp. 89, 24; 91, 2); also in cc. 14 and 15 (pp. 91, 3; 96, 23); these five chapters belong together. Again, in c. 26 there are references to c. 23 (pp. 143, 17; 146, 3), and in c. 35 to c. 30 (p. 186, 3). There is nothing to suggest that any of these references is editorial.

§ 28. Taking all the evidence together we may consider it a probable conclusion that the descriptions of ceremonies in Series 2 which imply only one emperor belonged to a ceremonial book composed in the reign of Michael III. Bardas was created Caesar on 19 April 862,[32] and in the following years we might expect that the influential Caesar should have had a special place in some of the ceremonies; and, as this is not the case, we may perhaps—though of course the consideration is by no means conclusive—consider 847 and 862 as the limits of date.

In the reign of Leo VI this collection was re-edited with considerable changes. New ceremonies instituted by Basil I were introduced. The ceremonies on Easter Day (9*b*) and 1 January (24) were rewritten. But most of the older descriptions were retained, notes being added which can generally be distinguished. We can fix the date of this recension to the years 900–903 (cp. §§ 22, 23).

The third stage is the recension of Constantine VII, who included the collection in his ceremonial book without making any further changes except the insertion of additional notes.

§ 29. We have still to consider c. 37, which forms a sort of appendix to the collection, explaining the details of the imperial costume at the various ceremonies which have been described. Bieliaev has drawn attention to two indications which enable us to fix its date.[33] The dress to be worn on Easter Monday (*περιβάλλονται τὰ λευκὰ χρυσᾶ σκαραμάγγια*, p. 188, 3) implies that the

[32] Genesios, p. 97; Hirsch, *Byz. Studien*, 173.
[33] *Priemy*, pp. 220, note, 233, note.

innovation made by Leo VI before A.D. 900 (see above, § 21) had already come into force, for the emperors usually wore skaramangia when they rode in ceremonial processions.[34] Again, we are told that on Mid-Pentecost they wore white (or purple) skaramangia (p. 188, 19), whence we may infer that this was written before A.D. 903, when the proeleusis to St. Mokios was discontinued. Thus c. 37 belongs to the second stage and was added to the revised ceremonial book *c.* 900–903 A.D.

§ 30. The form of c. 37 is to be noticed. It consists of a series of paragraphs, of which each (except the first) begins with the formula *ἰστέον ὅτι*. This formula is regularly used in Constantine's treatise *De Administrando Imperio*,[35] and it may fairly be taken as a guide to discriminate Constantine's editorial hand. It is invariably used in the marginal notes, which are clearly due to the Constantinian redaction. But when a paragraph is introduced by *ἰστέον ὅτι* or *χρὴ εἰδέναι* it is not necessarily an editorial addition. The words may simply be introduced as a formula of transition for the sake of clearness or to avoid an awkward abruptness. We shall notice hereafter (§ 40) a case in which it can be shown that *χρὴ γινώσκειν* was introduced by the editor for stylistic reasons. The formula in question may of course have been used occasionally in the older documents, but its prevalence in Constantinian literature justifies the presumption that it betokens Constantinian intervention, and we may probably conclude that the marking off of the paragraphs in c. 37 by *ἰστέον ὅτι* is due to Constantine.

The formula might be particularly useful in marking parenthetical notes, as in c. 17 (p. 107, 6), where *ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι . . . ἀπελατικούς* interrupts the progress of the description.

III. The Secular Ceremonies of Book I.

§ 31. The second part of book i. (cc. 38–83), which deals with secular ceremonies, is composite, like the first, consisting of documents of different dates. It is arranged in subjects and may be analysed as follows:—

cc. 38–42: ceremonies (coronations, &c.) connected with members of the imperial house.

cc. 43–59: investitures of officials and dignitaries (beginning with the Caesar and ending with the *protospatharios*).

c. 60: imperial burial ceremony.

c. 61: imperial birthday ceremony.

cc. 62–6: court *levées* or receptions (*δέξιμα*).

cc. 68–73: hippodrome ceremonies (horse races, &c.)

cc. 74–83: various.

[34] *Priemy*, p. 8, note.

[35] See my article on the treatise *De Administrando Imperio*, § 6, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xv., 1906.

It may at first seem awkward in this arrangement that cc. 60, 61 should be separated from cc. 38–42; but it is to be observed that the ceremonies of the first group are of the nature of investitures, with the exception of 42, which gives the acta on the occasion of the birth of a Porphyrogennetos and forms a natural appendix to 41 (the marriage and coronation of an Augusta). Thus the second group, beginning with the investiture of a Caesar (who would generally be a member of the imperial house), follows naturally.

§ 32. It is to be observed that two of the ceremonies of the first group relate to the same occasion. C. 39 is entitled ὅσα δεῖ παραφυλάττειν ἐπὶ στεφανώματι βασιλέως, and c. 41 ὅσα δεῖ παραφυλάττειν ἐπὶ στεψίμῳ αὐγούστης καὶ στεφανώματος. The ceremony is the marriage of a junior emperor, and the difference in the two cases is that in the former the bride is already an Augusta, in the latter she is crowned Augusta on the day of her marriage. C. 40 gives the ceremony of coronation when it is not connected with her nuptials.

The ceremony described in c. 39 is performed in the church of St. Stephen in the palace; but an editorial note is appended at the end (201, 19) to the effect that this has recently (ἐν τοῖς ἐσχάτοις καιροῖς) been changed, and that the nuptial coronation is now celebrated in the church of the Virgin in the Pharos. In c. 41 the nuptial coronation of the emperor and his bride is performed in St. Stephen's, immediately after the imperial coronation of the bride in the Augusteus; and there is no note as to any change.

Now we know that in A.D. 768 (17 December) Irene was crowned in the Augusteus and married to Leo IV in St. Stephen's in Daphne,[36] as ordained in c. 41. Hence Diehl has suggested[37] that c. 41 describes that ceremony, and in support of this he points especially to the mention of the κόμης τῶν ἀδμησιόνων. Otherwise we do not find this official mentioned under this name in the ceremonies except in the extracts from sixth-century documents at the end of book i.[38] But he is not 'an institution which has in the tenth century entirely disappeared,' as Diehl says. In the sixth century he was also called *admissionalis* (ἀδμισσιονάλιος),[39] and under this name we find him still existing in the tenth century.[40] But Diehl is right in noting the title 'count of the admissions' as a mark of comparative antiquity. It does point to the eighth century, when, though the Byzantine usages and nomenclature which we find in the ninth century had already been for the most part introduced, some old terms were still used which had become obsolete before A.D. 900.

[36] Theophanes, *s.a.*, ed. De Boor, p. 444.
[37] *Etudes byzantines*, p. 304.
[38] Pp. 386, 387.
[39] *Ibid.* pp. 394, 404–5.
[40] *Ibid.* p. 23, 8.

There is however a difficulty in considering c. 41, as it stands, a simple description of the ceremony of A.D. 768. It is impossible to suppose that the highest dignitaries of the palace, the Caesars and the *nobilissimus* who had been created earlier in the year, should not have had a part to play in the ceremony. To meet this difficulty I suggest that the same ceremony was used in the tenth century with appropriate modifications. In A.D. 933 Stephen, the son of Romanus I, married Anna, and we are expressly told that the coronation was performed simultaneously with the marriage: *ἅμα δὲ τῷ νυμφικῷ στεφάνῳ καὶ ὁ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῇ στέφανος ἐπετίθετο.*[41] That this detail should be stated seems significant; it certainly suggests that on recent occasions the two ceremonies had been kept separate, and their combination is therefore recorded as noteworthy. It is obvious that the ceremonial of A.D. 768, suitably modified, might have been followed.[42]

But c. 41 cannot be simply the description of the ceremony of A.D. 933 adapted from that of A.D. 768. For in A.D. 933 there were four basileis, and c. 41 contemplates only two (p. 213, 21). It is however natural to suppose that the combination of the two coronations, which was reintroduced according to my hypothesis in A.D. 933, was practised on the two next occasions of an imperial marriage—namely, the unions of Romanus II with Bertha in A.D. 944 and later with Theophano. In the last case there were only two basileis. My suggestion therefore is that in c. 41 we have a description of the marriage of Romanus and Theophano, based on the old document of A.D. 768. This explains, on the one hand, the appearance of the old-fashioned but still quite intelligible title *κόμης τῶν ἀδμησιόνων*, and, on the other, the non-appearance of the Caesars and *nobilissimus*.

It is obvious that the ceremony of c. 40 was wanted on occasions when there was no question of a marriage, such as the coronation of Theodora, wife of Romanus I (A.D. 921), of Sophia, wife of Christophoros (A.D. 922), of Anna, the daughter of Leo VI, and of Zoe, the same emperor's fourth wife. But it was also necessary in conjunction with that of c. 39, when the coronation and the marriage, though following each other closely, were not combined. This, according to the hypothesis above stated, would have been the case when Constantine VII espoused Helena in A.D. 919. If so, we can at once explain the editorial observation that the *στεφάνωμα*

[41] *Theoph. Contin.* p. 422; Theodosius Melit. (ed. Tafel), p. 231 (*ἐπετέθειτο*). Leo Gramm., p. 323, omits *αὐτῇ*. 'George Mon.' has *αὐτῷ* (p. 913), but Stephen had already been emperor since Christmas A.D. 926.

[42] I do not think that we can draw any conclusion as to the ceremonies of the first marriage of Leo VI (*Georg. Mon. Cont.* p. 846: *ἠγάγετο ὁ Βασιλεὺς Λέοντι τῷ βασιλεῖ θυγατέρα Μαρτινακίου, ἣν καὶ ἔστεψεν, ποιήσας τοὺς γάμους ἐν τῇ Μαγναύρᾳ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ιθ' ἀκουβίτοις*) from the fact that the Magnaura is mentioned in c. 41, though not in c. 39, 2 (pp. 231, 7; 232, 22).

had been transferred from St. Stephen's to the church of the Virgin ἐν τοῖς ἐσχάτοις καιροῖς, as due to Constantine himself. Such an expression could be naturally applied to anything that happened in his own reign. C. 39 would therefore go back to an earlier period, perhaps the reign of Basil I or Leo VI.

The acta of the factions in cc. 38, 40, and 42 are homogeneous with the acta of cc. 2–9*a*, which are related to the reign of Constantine VII; the Augustae and Porphyrogennetoi are acclaimed.

§ 33. In the second group most of the ceremonies contemplate more than one basileus. Of these cc. 43 and 44 must be at once set apart and associated with c. 41. Diehl has shown, from internal evidence, that they describe the proceedings on the occasion when Constantine V conferred the rank of Caesar on his sons Christophoros and Nikephoros, and that of *nobilissimus* on his fourth son, Niketas, on 2 April 768.[43]

Other ceremonies of this group must also be referred to the early Byzantine period. C. 46 consists of two sections, describing the ceremony for the investiture of a *magister*, according as it is performed on a great church festival or on an ordinary Sunday. We note that the Small Consistory is exceptionally designated in both descriptions as the Winter Consistory (pp. 233, 6; 235, 14). The Great Consistory used to be called the Summer Consistory, but the name is not used in any of the later documents; we only find it in a sixth-century ceremony (p. 405, 8).[44] In the second section we find other peculiarities which differentiate it from the ceremonial descriptions of the ninth and tenth centuries. We have the mysterious κόμητες σεκόρων (p. 235, 3) and the δομέστικοι πεδίτου and σχολάριοι πεδίτου (p. 236, 8), terms which went out of fashion. This, moreover, is the only place where we find a mention of a locality in the palace called οἱ Ἰνδοί.

The following c. 47, on the investiture of a patrician who is strategos of a theme (στρατηγοῦντος), has a remarkable point in common with c. 46. Here too we find κόμητες σεκόρων, and also κανδιδάτοι σεκόρων and δομέστικοι σεκόρων (p. 237, 11).[45] Whatever

[43] For the details see Diehl, *ibid.* 298 *sqq.* Cp. Theophanes, ed. De Boor, *s.a.* p. 443. As another though superfluous item of proof I may point out the appearance of the *referendarius* in c. 44 (p. 225, 17). The *referendarius* is familiar in the sixth century (e.g. in Procopius and *Cod. Just.*) In the *Ceremonies* we find him in an excerpt from Peter the Patrician (p. 390), but I believe that, as the name of a secular official, ῥεφερενδάριος does not occur in the *Ceremonies* (nor in later literature), except here and in two other chapters (cc. 47, 48) which we shall see reason for supposing to be earlier than the ninth century. The ecclesiastical *referendarius* survived; see e.g. *De Cer.* I. 1, p. 9, 3.

[44] On these consistories see Bieliaev, *Obzor*, pp. 118–9.

[45] If σεκόρων is right (the emendations proposed by Leichius are impossible) the titles can have been current only for a short time, as they are found nowhere else. The *vela* in c. 47 are (1) magistri, (2) patricians, (3) hypatoi, (4) comites σεκόρων, (5) candidati σεκόρων, (6) domestici σεκόρων, (7) ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων and στρατηλάται. (The

σεκόρων means, whether it be sound or corrupt, we are not in the tenth (or the ninth) century; while the general character of the ceremony shows that we are not in the sixth or the seventh. Again, we have the *secundicerius* (p. 238, 2), a name which is borne only by an ecclesiastical official in later times. We have, too, the referendarius (pp. 237, 13 ; 240, 19) ; see above, p. 431, note 43.

A complete revision of the court ceremonies was necessitated by the reorganisation of the institutions of Diocletian and Constantine, which was carried out early in the eighth century by Leo III. The official world was largely reconstituted; titles and ranks were changed, and the general schemes of the ceremonies must have been altered to meet the new conditions. Though endless alterations in detail were made by succeeding emperors the character of the ceremonial, as then reformed, was permanent. In the first (Isaurian) period, as we might expect, some old terms were still used which afterwards fell into desuetude. Cc. 46 and 47 evidently belong to this period. Both assume two emperors, who will be Leo III and Constantine V, or Constantine V and Leo IV.

C. 48 seems also to belong to the same period. Here too the referendarius appears (p. 246, 19), though instead of the *κόμητες σεκόρων* we have the *κόμητες τῶν σχολῶν*. Moreover there is only one *βασιλεύς*. The later part of the ceremony was afterwards modified in details, and a description of the new order is added, under the title *ἀκτολογία τῶν δήμων κ.τ.λ.* Thus the portion pp. 249, 20–251, 14 is superseded by pp. 251, 16–255, 8. The acclamations of the Augustae and Porphyrogennetoi in the new description seem to point to the reign of Constantine VII.

C. 49 seems to be connected with c. 48. There is only one basileus, and there are back references to it (pp. 256, 2, 20 ; 257, 1). For the other chapters of this group we have no clear indications, except that c. 53 appears to be a tenth-century addition (like the end of c. 48) to c. 52. But the whole group probably formed a series dating from the eighth century. It may be noted that c. 59 presumes c. 58 (p. 275, 3).

§ 34. In the group of chapters relating to *dexima* cc. 62, 63 belong closely together, and are clearly contemporaneous. They contain the acta of the factions on the eve and the day of a dexi-

ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων or *στρατηλάτης* was at this time the lowest grade of rank, as in A.D. 900 : see Philotheos, p. 708, 7.) In c. 48 we have eight *vela*. The patricians appear in two *vela* : (2) anthypatoi, (3) *πατρίκιοι καὶ στρατηγοί* ; and the hypatoi are replaced by (4) *ἡ σύγκλητος*. Then we have (5) comites scholarum, (6) candidati, (7) domestici, (8) *ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων*. It seems clear therefore that (5) (6) (7) of c. 48 correspond to (4) (5) (6) of c. 47, and both mean the same classes. In the *vela* which were introduced in the ceremony of Easter Day, as described in c. 9 *b*, we find the same order at the end of the list (p. 61) : (6) comites scholarum, (7) imperial candidati, (8) domestici scholarum (9) *ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων*.

mon on the anniversary of an emperor's accession. A note is added at the end of c. 63 to the effect that the proceedings are the same for the dexima, only that the *apelatikoi*, *trilexia*, and *tetralekta* are to be different, according to the occasion. These chapters seem to have been compiled in their present form in the reign of Constantine VII.[46] C. 65 belongs to the same time.

On the other hand cc. 64, 66 (67), in which there is only one basileus, belong together. When c. 64 was written, the proeleusis on the Monday after the first Sunday after Easter was still to St. Mokios; it was therefore written before A.D. 900 (see above, § 23), and, as only one basileus appears, may probably be ascribed to the reign of Michael III. Now in this chapter (p. 284, 21) we find a reference to another ceremony: *οἱ δὲ πραιπόσιτοι εἰσελθόντες ἐν τῷ τριπέτωνι, ὡς ἀνωτέρω εἴρηται.* Nothing has been said before to which the last words can refer. We have to turn to c. 66 to discover the passage which must be meant (p. 296, 14): *καὶ ὁ πραιπόσιτος εἰσελθὼν ἐν τῷ τριπέτωνι κ.τ.λ.* It follows that 66 and 64 were together in one collection, but that when they were received into the compilation of Constantine VII their order was reversed and they were separated by another ceremony (65). C. 67 is an appendix to c. 66 (to which it refers, p. 301, 21), but although the single basileus of 66 is preserved it is clearly an editorial addition (cp. *ἰστέον ὅτι* pp. 301, 20; 302, 25).

§ 35. The first chapter (68) of the Hippodrome group is remarkable. It belongs to a period later than the sixth century, but when some of the ministers who were abolished by the Isaurian reorganisation were still in existence. That it is later than the sixth century is shown not only by its general style, which is far nearer to that of the later ceremonies than the style of the documents of the Justinianean age, and specially by the appearance of the ceremonial officer *ὁ τῆς καταστάσεως*, of whom there is no trace in the sixth century, but the praetorian prefect of the east still exists.[47] There is only one basileus. The date might, for instance, be the reign of Justinian II, or the first years of Leo III.[48] It is probable enough that details of the ceremony were altered by subsequent editors, but the reference to the obsolete praetorian prefect was overlooked.

C. 70 presents close resemblances to c. 68, and was to all appearances drafted in its original form at the same time; but all anachronisms seem to have been eliminated.

[46] Reiske's argument in his note, pp. 294–5, depends on the collocation of cc. 62–3 with c. 64. But c. 64 dates from a different period.

[47] P. 306, 11. Here we have the *ἰστέον ὅτι* which the later compilers used so constantly.

[48] Even after the coronation of Constantine V (A.D. 720), then an infant, before he was old enough to be present at such ceremonies.

Cc. 72 and 73 (except the aktologia) contemplate a single basileus, but need not be older than the reign of Michael III.

In the other chapters of this group more basileis than one appear, and the acta have generally been brought up to the date of Constantine VII. But there is one significant exception which furnishes a definite chronological indication. In c. 69 a section occurs entitled *ἄκτα ἐπὶ μεγιστάνῳ ἀμειρᾷ ἐν πολέμῳ ἡττηθέντι καὶ ἀναιρεθέντι.* These brief acta acclaim one basileus, but more than one Augusta. The two cases in which there were two Augustae and only one emperor were in the reigns of Constantine VI and Michael III. But we have no record of the slaying of an emir in the former reign (a success which Theophanes could hardly have omitted to chronicle); and the only serious success gained against the Saracens (the victory of Anusan) occurred, as it happens, just at a moment when there was only one Augusta, in the interval between the divorce of Maria and the marriage of Theodote.[49] On the other hand the most conspicuous victory of Roman arms under Michael III was marked by the death of the Saracen leader, Omar ibn-Ubeid-allah-al-Akta, the emir of Melitene, on the battle field.[50] Petronas, the Roman general, was rewarded by receiving the rank of *magister*. This happened in the year A.D. 863. We know that Michael's mother, the empress Theodora, who had been sent to a cloister *c.* 856 A.D., was afterwards released, but the date of her recovery of freedom was unknown. We may infer that she was released and received formal honours, though she had no political influence, by A.D. 863. The other Augusta was Michael's wife, Eudokia, daughter of Dekapolites, of whose life we otherwise know nothing.

It is to be observed that an incident which occurred at a race in the time of Michael III is recorded in c. 71 (p. 358, 11).

It seems probable that c. 69 as a whole appeared in the collection dating from the reign of Michael III, and that it was revised and modified to suit his own time by Constantine VII; only the acta celebrating the death of an emir, and seldom required, were allowed to remain unaltered.

§ 36. We obtain an interesting glimpse of the process of bringing up to date in c. 73. In the acta, which form the second part of this chapter, the following spring song, in 'political' verses, is to be chanted by the people:—

> *ἴδε τὸ ἔαρ τὸ γλυκὺ πάλιν ἐπανατέλλει,*
> *χαρὰν, ὑγίειαν καὶ ζωὴν καὶ τὴν εὐημερίαν,*
> *ἀνδραγαθίαν ἐκ Θεου τοῖς βασιλεῦσι Ῥωμαίων*
> *καὶ νίκην θεοῖώρητον κατὰ τῶν πολεμίων.*

[49] Theophanes, *s.a.* 6287, ed. De Boor, p. 469.
[50] For the details see Vasil'iev, *Vizantiia i Araby*, i. 201.

The second half of the third verse is a syllable too long, and Krumbacher rightly conjectured *τῷ βασιλεῖ*.[51] But *τοῖς βασιλεῦσι* is not a mere scribal error; it is clearly a deliberate correction, to harmonise with the rest of the acta, which acclaim more than one basileus. The correction was made mechanically, without regard to the metre; the right correction was *τοῖς δεσπόταις*, and no doubt was thus actually chanted when there were two or more reigning sovrans.

In the preceding portion of the chapter, in which only one emperor appears, the first and second verses are quoted with variations (366, 9):

ἴδε τὸ ἔαρ τὸ καλὸν πάλιν ἐπανατέλλει,
φέρον ὑγίειαν καὶ χαρὰν καὶ τὴν εὐημερίαν.

This is evidently the older form, and it is superior in point of construction. When *φέρον* is omitted the syntax is loose; the accusatives are in apposition to the cognate object of *ἐπανατέλλει*. The purpose of the change was to introduce *ζωήν*, and, as such a change demands a motivation, I hazard the guess that it might have been introduced after the second marriage of Leo VI, with Zoe, daughter of Stylianos, a guess which those who know how fond the Byzantines were of plays on names will not consider extravagant.

It is important to remark that these verses occur in a description which was drafted at least as early as the reign of Michael III. It shows definitely that political verses were a fully established form of composition in the ninth century. The metre, of course, is of much older origin. Krumbacher has pointed out proverbs, couched in this metre, which go back to the sixth century.[52] But it was possibly in the ninth century that it began to come into vogue, though one would not be surprised if the spring song was much older. I have pointed out that the political metre probably occurs in the interchange of wit between Theophilus and Kasia on the occasion of that emperor's brideshow.[53]

§ 37. The last group, of miscellaneous ceremonies (cc. 74–83), are, for the most part, of high antiquity, as is shown by the number of Latin words and formulae. They were not however obsolete; they were still practised, in their old forms, in the tenth century, and beyond the retention of the Latin phrases there is nothing anachronistic. In the number of emperors and empresses they are all suitable to the reign of Constantine VII.

§ 38. It results from our examination that in the secular ceremonies there are (in contrast with the ecclesiastical) a number

[51] *Gesch. der Byz. Litt.*² p. 255.
[52] *Mittelgriechische Sprichwörter*, pp. 233–4.
[53] Gibbon, ed. Bury, v. 199, note; Pseudo-Symeon, p. 625, ed. Bonn.

of descriptions which must have been originally drafted in the Isaurian period. Such are 43, 44 ; probably 41 ; 46–48 ; probably 49 ; and 68 may be even older. And there are others which we may suspect were originally composed in that period, though anomalies, which would reveal the date, have been eliminated. Further, we have noticed indications pointing to the reign of Michael III.

IV. Conclusions as to the Sources of Book I.

§ 39. We may now sum up the general conclusions which our analysis yields as to the materials which Constantine VII wrought into his first book. He speaks of his work as one of collection (*συναθροισθέντα*) as well as arrangement, and this shows that he did not simply revise one older ceremonial book, but gathered documents from different collections or sources. This evident inference from his own statement was confirmed by the demonstration of Bieliaev that the ecclesiastical ceremonies were derived from two distinct collections.

In the light of our examination of the work we may infer that the following main sources were at the disposal of Constantine: (1) The sixth-century *πολιτικὴ κατάστασις*, from which he transcribed the concluding chapters of the book (84-95), as possessing antiquarian interest. (2) A ceremonial book of the Isaurian period. This period must have witnessed a general revision of court ceremonial, rendered necessary by the reorganisation of the official world. Such a book, required for the use of the court, was probably kept up to date and augmented by new additions by the praepositus or the official known as *ὁ τῆς καταστάσεως*, who directed the ceremonies. Thus the descriptions of special ceremonies performed under Constantine V may have been added to a collection which had originated under Leo III. (3) Our evidence points to the reign of Michael III as another stage in the history of the ceremonial. On general grounds this is not unexpected. The restoration of image-worship furnishes a particular motive for revision at that epoch. The ecclesiastical ceremonies arranged under iconoclastic sovrans required alterations. These ceremonies have been so carefully revised or rewritten that we find no indications pointing beyond the reign of Michael III. It is impossible to say whether the secular ceremonies were as carefully worked up. Those descriptions in which we find marks of the Isaurian period may have been taken by Constantine from the Isaurian book and not from the revised book of the ninth century. This latter book received additions and modifications in the reign of Leo VI, and was the actual ceremonial book up to the time of Constantine's compilation, though not in all respects up to date.

It seems to me probable that the acta of the demes were not included in this book, but formed (4) a separate collection. For these acta specially concerned the officers of the demes, and did not directly concern the palace officials who arranged the general ceremonial. This difference of origin would account for the difference in the arrangement of the feasts of the ecclesiastical year in the acta (c. 2 *sqq.*) and in the general ceremonies (see above, § 20). The idea of a ceremonial book including the acta would have been due to Constantine VII.[54]

If these conclusions are right we can understand Constantine's precise description of his own editorial work. He found the material, he says, *χύδην τε καὶ σποράδην ἐκτεθειμένα*. It was disordered (*χύδην*), because the ceremonial book had grown, new ceremonies being added as they occurred, and consequently not occupying the place in the general order which their date or their nature would assign to them. It was scattered (*σποράδην*), because the acta had to be sought in a different place, and probably the older book of the Isaurian period contained ceremonies (e.g. cc. 43, 44) omitted in its revision. Further, Constantine describes some of his material as *ἐξίτηλα ὄντα ἤδη καὶ τῷ γέροντι χρόνῳ συγγεγηρακότα καὶ ὅσον οὔπω πρὸς ἀνυπαρξίαν περιστήσεσθαι μέλλοντα*. This probably refers to some of the ancient ceremonies, like the Gothic game (c. 83), in which the Latin formulae were extensively retained, and suggests that they did not occur in the latest ceremonial book (or books). The Gothic game, for instance, may have been preserved in the archives of the demes.

With such materials Constantine had to do much in the way of arrangement to produce *εἱρμός τις καὶ τάξις λελογισμένη*. It is for collection and arrangement that he takes credit. We were able to detect one case where he changed the order in which two ceremonies had stood in a previous edition (above, § 34). There may be another more remarkable instance. In c. 18 (p. 109, 3) we read, *ὁ βασιλεὺς . . . στέφεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πραιποσίτου διὰ τὸ ὅλως ὡς ἀνωτέρω εἴρηται ἔμπροσθε βαρβάτων μὴ στέφεσθαι*. Nothing of the kind has been said in the previous pages. But in c. 66 (p. 298, 8) we find, *χρὴ εἰδέναι ὅτι ἐνώπιον ὁ βασιλεὺς οὐδέποτε στέφεται, ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀρχῆς ταύτης τῆς παραδόσεως φυλαττομένης*. It is possible, however, that this taboo was mentioned in the lost part of c. 9*b*, and therefore we cannot infer with certainty that c. 66 preceded c. 18 in the ninth-century ceremonial book.

Comparative analysis of the details of the ceremonies may discover new criteria for chronological discrimination. The secular ceremonies have still to be examined with the same care which Bieliaev bestowed on the ecclesiastical.

[54] This may also apply to the descriptions of some of the Hippodrome ceremonies.

§ 40. It has been hinted in the foregoing investigation that the editorial activity of Constantine was not confined to collection, selection, arrangement, and the insertion of notes (whether by way of addition or by way of correction), but that he may also have revised the text of some of the ceremonial descriptions which he incorporated. From the nature of the case it would be difficult to prove this directly if we did not accidentally possess the proceedings *ἐπὶ προαγωγῇ δημάρχου* (in c. 55), in two forms, which follow each other in the manuscript. The duplicate is printed by Reiske in his *Commentary* (p. 289). There are a number of variations which are not due to scribal inaccuracy. The document in the text is more carefully written and shows some superiorities in syntax and style to the duplicate. It also presents curtailments, one or two additions, and a number of small differences not affecting the general sense. I may give one illustration :—

Text (p. 271).	Reiske (p. 290).
χρὴ δὲ γινώσκειν ὅτι προλαμβάνουσιν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ προβληθέντος ὁ αὐτὸς γειτονιάρχης καὶ ὁ νοτάριος καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ καὶ ἵστανται μετὰ τοῦ μέρους εὐφημοῦντες τὸν προβληθέντα εἰς τὸν πυλῶνα αὐτοῦ.	*πρὸ τοῦ δὲ φθάσαι τὸν δήμαρχον προλαμβάνουσιν ὅ τε γειτονιάρχης καὶ ὁ νοτάριος μετὰ καὶ τοῦ μέρους καὶ ἵστανται καὶ εὐφημοῦσιν τὸν δήμαρχον εἰς τὸν πυλῶνα αὐτοῦ.*

Observe the introduction of the transitional *χρὴ δὲ γινώσκειν* (cp. above, § 30).

The nature of the variations enables us to solve the problem which puzzled Reiske. *Qui factum fuerit ut hoc caput in M bis scriberetur, aliquali tamen cum discrepantia, non exputo.* The solution is that the second is the older draft, the first a revised and improved copy of it, made for insertion in Constantine's compilation. The second was transcribed, through pure carelessness, *instead of another document.* For there is a heading to it: *ἀκτολογία τῶν δήμων ἐπὶ προαγωγῇ δημάρχου.* Instead of copying these acta the copyist inadvertently transcribed the discarded draft of the ceremony which he had just written out in its revised form.

This case permits us to infer that others too of the ceremonial descriptions which were taken from older collections into the new compilation have been stylistically and otherwise revised in Constantine's literary workshop. Constantine had his standard of style even for the *φράσις καθωμιλημένη*, and was, in this respect, as we shall presently see, prepared to be critical.

V. The Treatise *περὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν ταξειδίων.*

§ 41. In the Leipzig MS. the treatise 'De Cerimoniis' begins on f. 21v. Ff. 1–21r contain two short pieces which, though they have nothing to do with the ceremonies, have been strangely and

injudiciously printed as 'Appendix ad librum primum.'[55] The first of these pieces (ff. 1–4r) is clearly a fragment. There is no title or introduction; it opens abruptly with a list of stations (*ἄπληκτα*) at which the emperor halts on a military journey through Asia Minor. The second piece has a full title, and is dedicated by Constantine to his son Romanus. It is concerned with the arrangements for military expeditions, in which the emperor personally takes part.

The author's prefatory remarks to this treatise are interesting. He caused a search to be made in the palace for memoranda bearing on the subject. He found none, but subsequently (*ὀψὲ καὶ μόλις*) he discovered the existence of a work, in the monastery of Sigriane, by Leo Katakylas,[56] a *magister* who became a monk. It was written by order of Leo VI. Paying a tribute to the writer's piety, Constantine is severe upon his want of literary education (*παιδεία Ἑλληνική*) and his barbarous style. Nor was Leo's work complete. It hardly contained a third of the information which Constantine promises. Constantine also makes the important observation that the *τάξις τε καὶ ἀκολουθία* observed on these expeditions was handed down from the Isaurian period.[57]

Now the subject of this treatise and that of the fragment which precedes it are precisely the same. The theme is thus stated by Constantine in his preface (456, 6): *ἀναγκαιότερον δὲ τί ἄλλο γένοιτο πολεμικῆς εὐτολμίας καὶ τῆς τῶν προγόνων παλαιᾶς εὐταξίας ἣν ἐν πολέμοις εἶχον τὸ πρότερον βασιλικοῖς ταξειδίοις κατάστασιν;* the headings of the two sections contained in the fragment are: *ὑπόθεσις τῶν βασιλικῶν ταξειδίων καὶ ὑπόμνησις τῶν ἀπλήκτων*, and *ὅσα δεῖ παραφυλάττειν βασιλέως μέλλοντος ταξιδεύειν.* It is impossible to suppose that we have to do with two distinct works. The fragment is evidently part, or was intended to form part, of the treatise which follows it. Either some of the pages of the original manuscript got misplaced or, as is much more probable, these two sections had been prepared for incorporation in the treatise but had not been incorporated, and were found in physical juxtaposition with it by that redactor, who is responsible for the form in which the 'De Cerimoniis' has come down. We have therefore to do with a single treatise, which might be called *περὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν ταξειδίων*, and which in histories of literature should be dissociated from the work on the ceremonies and hold a distinct place of its own. J. B. BURY.

[55] This misled Rambaud (*op. cit.* p. 129) into supposing that the two books were separated 'par deux appendices' *in the MS.* Krumbacher (*Gesch. der Byz. Litt.*), who seldom overlooks anything, has overlooked the so-called Appendix.

[56] For his career see De Boor, *Vita Euthymii*, pp. 140–2.

[57] The treatise contains one section (pp. 495–8) which is evidently transcribed from a document of the time of Justinian. It refers to an entry of that emperor into the capital (in A.M. 6033). We are here in the days of Persian wars, and consistorian counts, and tribunes, and *protectores*.